

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY of opinion and discussion

VOL. XXIX

Summer, 1960

No. 3

CONTENTS

Editorial 328

Edinburgh 1910-1960 and The World Council of Churches

1. Reflections on Edinburgh, 1910.....J. H. OLDHAM 329
2. Edinburgh, 1910—Ecumenical Keystone...WILLIAM RICHEY HOGG 339
3. Developments in the "Younger Churches" Since
Edinburgh, 1910.....KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE 352
4. The Call to Unity in Our Time.....THEODORE O. WEDEL 363
5. The Contribution of Eastern Orthodoxy to
the Ecumenical Movement.....ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS 373
6. The World Council and the Creedless Church..HOWARD H. BRINTON 383
7. What Next?.....STEPHEN NEILL 394

The Holy Spirit and the Church.....PHILIP S. WATSON 402

The Church as Educator.....WESNER FALLAW 416

Is Ecumenical Curriculum Possible?.....IRIS V. CULLY 426

Let Us Not Forget the Mighty William Ames.....DOUGLAS HORTON 434

Religion and the Arts

Albert Camus' Quest for Ethical Values.....ROBERT H. BRYANT 443

The Fourth Gospel as Drama.....EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 453

Commentary: Protestants and Catholics in the United States

MARIA F. SULZBACH 455

Book Reviews and Notices..... 458

Editorial

THE GALAXY of articles in this issue touching upon the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910 and subsequent developments is a partial indication of the scope and depth of the ecumenical influences that flowed from that gathering. Nothing need be added to these presentations. In fact, the list of contributors makes up a present-day counterpart of the roster of distinguished names mentioned by Dr. Oldham, who is himself the living link between these ecumenical generations. It is significant to be able to bracket presentations from such widely different traditions as those of Archbishop Iakovos and Howard Brinton, not to mention the others, and then to conclude with the profoundly challenging and forward-looking analysis by Stephen Neill.

If one may venture to supplement Dr. Oldham's brilliant personal recollections at one point, another of the architects and leading figures of that Edinburgh assembly was Dr. William Douglas Mackenzie, South African-born Scotchman, then President of Hartford Theological Seminary. His deep missionary concern and his brilliant statesmanship led to his appointment as Chairman of Commission V, dealing with "Special Missionary Preparation." The report of that Commission declared, and deplored the fact, that the churches had made no adequate provision for proper special training of prospective foreign missionaries. It had been assumed that a Call of God was all that was needed, whereas the Commission felt that advance study of the history, the religions, and the culture of an area, together with at least some basic language preparation, would greatly facilitate initial contacts with any peoples, and make possible more effective Christian witness.

This proposition was discussed the following January by the Foreign Mission Societies of America, and a Board of Missionary Preparation was set up with Dr. Mackenzie as Chairman. Shortly thereafter he recommended to the Hartford Seminary Trustees the establishment of "A School of Missions for special preparation of those under appointment . . . for foreign mission work, and for further educational aid to returned missionaries." His proposal was soon implemented, and thus, within a year of Edinburgh, the pioneering Kennedy School of Missions came into being, a direct outgrowth of that Conference plus the vision and leadership of one man. Since that time, this school, its faculty made up of seasoned experts from many mission fields and academic disciplines, has been fitting men and women of all denominations for service overseas.

Next year at the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches, many important decisions will be made affecting every aspect of the missionary enterprise, as well as the entire ecumenical movement. May the bold yet gracious spirit that was evident at Edinburgh prevail also at New Delhi!

R.W.B.

Edinburgh 1910-1960 and The World Council of Churches

1. Reflections on Edinburgh, 1910

J. H. OLDHAM

I HAVE BEEN ASKED to contribute an article to this anniversary issue of *RELIGION IN LIFE* on the ground that I am the only survivor of those who took an active part in the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, and had the opportunity of knowing how it looked from the inside.

I

When the Ecumenical Missionary Conference was held in New York in 1900 there was a general understanding that another international missionary conference should meet in about ten years' time. A few years later the energetic Home Secretary of the Foreign Mission Board of the Free Church of Scotland made the suggestion that the Conference should meet in Scotland, the native land of David Livingstone, Alexander Duff and other famous missionaries. The proposal met with general acceptance. A committee was formed to make the necessary preparations. Though the committee included representatives of the missionary societies having their headquarters in London, the meetings were always held in Edinburgh, and as a result none of the members resident in London attended them.

I was at that time engaged in the promotion of missionary study in Scotland, and at the instance of Dr. George Robson, one of the outstanding missionary leaders of the day, I was made a member of the committee, though very junior in age to all my colleagues.

My outlook had been formed by association with the World's Student Christian Federation, founded twelve years earlier, and it was a shock to me to find that the preparations for an international conference were being

J. H. OLDHAM, M.A., D.D., Anglican layman, was Secretary of the International Committee that planned the Edinburgh Conference, Secretary of the Continuation Committee (leading to the International Missionary Council), Editor of the *Christian News Letter*, and secretary of various committees that drew up plans for the World Council of Churches. He is now retired and resides at Grey Friars, Guestling, Sussex, England.

made by a committee that was in practice exclusively Scottish. I talked the matter over with Dr. Robson and found that he shared my view. The outcome of our conversation was that he moved a resolution at the next meeting of the Committee proposing that future meetings should be held at York instead of Edinburgh, with a view to making it easier for London members of the Committee to attend, and I seconded the motion. It was defeated by about forty votes to two. As we left the meeting Dr. Robson took my arm and said, "Don't be discouraged; this is not the end of the matter." I replied, "No, we can talk with Mott about it at the Student Volunteer Missionary Conference at Liverpool." This was due to meet in a few weeks' time, in January, 1908.

In due course Dr. Robson, Dr. Mott and I spent an evening together in a Liverpool hotel. We explained the situation to Mott, who emphatically took the view that an international conference must be from the start internationally planned. He promised that his first action on his return to America should be to call a meeting of representatives of the Foreign Mission Boards, with a view to their submitting this proposal to the Scottish Committee. In less than a month a letter arrived in Edinburgh, suggesting that an international committee should meet in the summer of that year, and undertaking to send a strong American delegation to such a meeting. I learned that in the making of history chance meetings may have unexpectedly far-reaching consequences. By Mott's action the planning of the Edinburgh Conference was transferred from a national to an international committee. If this change had not taken place, the developments of the last fifty years would have been quite different from what they were.

The International Committee met at Oxford in July, 1908. At the last moment I was asked to take the place of one of the four Scottish representatives, who had suddenly been taken ill. Mott was elected Chairman of the Committee, and I was asked to act as its secretary. As the plans for the conference took shape, Mott insisted that the program could not be carried out effectively without a whole-time secretary, and I was asked to accept this appointment. It was the first time that any international Christian gathering had had the services of a whole-time officer in its preparation. This budgetary provision enabled us to set up eight international commissions and to plan things on a scale that would otherwise have been quite out of reach.

One of the notable figures among the members of the Committee was Silas McBee, the editor of *The Churchman* in the United States, a churchman to his fingertips and possessing unusual vitality and vision. His

imagination pictured from the beginning a body resembling the World Council of Churches. I am inclined to think that his influence on the forthcoming Conference was second only to that of Mott. Another member of the Committee who exercised a strong influence on the course of events was Tissington Tatlow, the Secretary of the Student Christian Movement in Great Britain, who represented the views of the younger generation.

An amusing incident of the meeting remains in my memory. The Committee was housed in Wycliffe Hall. One of the Continental delegates, though his bedroom was in a different wing of the building and on a different floor, snored so loudly that Mott could not get to sleep. He rose shortly after midnight, packed his bag, and migrated to the Randolph Hotel, where he was able to enjoy a good night's rest.

An early decision taken by the Committee was that the Conference should be composed of delegates officially appointed by missionary boards and societies. Christian missionary gatherings up to that time had been open to all individuals who cared to attend. At the New York Conference in 1900 some of those who took part attended as representatives nominated by the Societies to which they belonged, but the Conference was open also to private individuals. The decision at Oxford established a new precedent on which the ecumenical movement was based.

This decision at once raised another question to which an answer had to be found, i.e. which missionary boards and societies should be invited to send delegates. The answer given was that participation in the Conference should be limited to missionary boards and societies carrying on work among professedly non-Christian peoples. This clear demarcation of the field had, as will be seen in the sequel, far-reaching consequences, unforeseen at the time when the decision was taken.

This decision was not based so much on grounds of principle as on the practical and inescapable necessity of deciding to what organizations invitations should be sent. The most compelling reason, perhaps, was that it was known that the Anglo-Catholics, and perhaps also others, would not participate in a conference which concerned itself with the conversion of Roman Catholics to Protestantism. The decision gave rise to acute controversy in the United States, and led, in the end, to the establishment of the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America. There were, however, several factors which made the demarcation almost inevitable. The missionary societies on the Continent of Europe objected no less strongly to the inclusion in the program of activities which aimed at persuading (e.g.) Lutherans to become Methodists or Baptists. Further, there were in

Great Britain what were called Colonial Missionary Societies, which carried on work among emigrants in such countries as Canada and Australia—a type of work which obviously involved different problems from missionary work among non-Christians. Any other line than the one adopted would have given rise to insoluble problems.

A third important decision was that questions of faith and order, about which the participating bodies differed among themselves, would not come within the purview of the conference. Here again it was the attitude of the Anglo-Catholics which forced this question to the front. But the decision had the strong support of the ecclesiastically-minded representatives of other leading denominations than the Church of England. Viewed in retrospect it was a clearly right decision. Questions of faith and order are the proper concern, not of the missionary boards or societies, but of the Churches themselves. A conference, the interest of which was focused on the overseas work of the Churches, was not the place for their consideration. If they were to form part of its program, the membership of the Conference would have to be quite different. A large part of it would have had to consist of theologians, and the Churches, not the missionary boards, would have had to choose their representatives. Because the decision taken was right, it resulted later in the correct measures for the consideration of the matters which this Conference recognized to be beyond its scope.

Reference has been made more than once to the Anglo-Catholics and the importance of securing their participation in the Conference. This is partly because, in fact, dealing with the question engaged a substantial part of my energies, but also because, as later events proved, much more was at stake than might appear at first sight. Up to that time Anglo-Catholics had held aloof from interdenominational gatherings. These had been composed almost exclusively of those who held what would now be called a conservative Evangelical view. But the World's Student Christian Federation had chosen its speakers at its meetings from a wider range of churchmanship embracing both Anglo-Catholics and what were then known as broad churchmen. As a result of this, contacts and friendships had been established between leading churchmen of different schools of thought, who but for this might never have met. Though the Grindelwald Conferences, organized by Sir Henry Lunn, were also an influence in this direction, it is safe to say that without the influence exerted by the World's Student Christian Federation the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 could not have taken the form that it did.

The younger generation, which had assimilated the outlook of the World's Student Christian Federation, set the greatest store on the participation of Anglo-Catholics in the Edinburgh Conference. Bishop Montgomery (the father of Field Marshall Lord Montgomery), at that time the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, told me that if I could secure the adhesion of Bishop Gore, he thought he could bring his Society into the Conference. I spent an evening at Birmingham with the Bishop, and when the points at issue had been fully talked over, he consented to attend the Conference, and later the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel agreed to participate.

This was the turning point in the history of the ecumenical movement. It made it possible for the Archbishop of Canterbury to deliver an address to the Edinburgh Conference in the assembly hall of the Free Church of Scotland—which was something quite new and was much criticised in certain quarters. The fact that from that time onwards the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church of England was represented in what became later the International Missionary Council, made it much easier later for William Temple, as Archbishop of York, and later of Canterbury, to take the leading part that he did in the ecumenical movement than it would have been if the Church of England had been sharply divided. Without the full participation of the Church of England in the ecumenical movement the Orthodox Churches would have been more hesitant about taking part, and other bodies which had doubts about interdenominational co-operation would have been more ready to find excuses for remaining apart.

II

When the Conference met, John R. Mott, still in his forties, was elected chairman and presided over all the sessions of the Conference. He proved himself a master of assemblies. A feature of the Conference which excited much comment at the time was his introduction of the seven-minute limit for all speeches in debate. At the first morning session for discussion the first speaker was Bishop Gore. He felt it necessary to explain why the Anglo-Catholics had agreed to participate in the Conference and on what understanding they did so. At the expiration of seven minutes Mott rose from his chair. Bishop Gore, observing the action, stepped off the low platform in the middle of a sentence and resumed his seat on the floor of the assembly—some people said that he broke off in the middle of a hyphenated word, but I cannot vouch for this. There were demands from all sides that he should continue, but he resolutely refused to leave his

seat. Reinforced by this example, Mott successfully maintained the seven-minute rule throughout the session. To one inexperienced in the ways of public assemblies like myself, it was a surprise how large a proportion of the speakers took three or four minutes out of their seven to explain why they could not possibly say what they wanted to say in seven minutes. The triumph of the Conference was a speech by a Chinese delegate who in his seven minutes made seven distinct points with telling effect.

The most memorable speech during the Conference was, for me, that made by Bishop Brent of the Philippines, one of the most forceful personalities who took part in the Conference. He wholeheartedly agreed with the provision which excluded from the purview of the Conference questions of faith and order, but he went on to insist that it was precisely these questions that most urgently needed to be examined at the proper time and place by those competent to consider them. He announced his intention of taking immediate steps after his return to America to bring into existence an organ for this purpose. For two years I had been defending the decision that questions of faith and order should remain outside the scope of the Conference, and instantly recognized the immense significance of Bishop Brent's statement.

Many years later Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden told me in conversation that what had prompted him to call together the Stockholm Conference, which led to the formation of the Universal Christian Council of Life and Work, was that the Churches had already in the International Missionary Council an organ for consultation and co-operation about their work overseas, and in the Faith and Order Conference an instrument for conferring about their theological differences, but that there was no international organization for the joint consideration of their practical problems in the home field and their relations with secular society. He felt that it was necessary to fill this large gap.

These later events showed that the taking of clear-cut decisions in preparation for the Edinburgh Conference and the acceptance of necessary limitations led directly to the taking of steps required to complete the ecumenical program.

Prior to the meeting of the Edinburgh Conference memoranda had been prepared in America, on the Continent of Europe and in Great Britain, recommending that the Conference should set up some permanent body for continuing the work of international co-operation. Definite proposals for this were made by one of the commissions of the Conference. One would have supposed that, with so much support, approval of the

proposals would have been a matter of course. In actual fact, however, when it came to the point of making the leap, the greatest hesitancy was shown. It became quite uncertain whether the proposal would be accepted by the Conference. I believe that but for the unclouded vision and exceptional force of conviction of John R. Mott the decision would have gone the other way.

The hesitancy that was displayed incidentally determined my own fate. I was strongly in favor of the establishment of a Continuation Committee, the arguments for which seemed to me conclusive, but I did not want to be its secretary. I had become aware in experience of the difficulties of international co-operation, and I shrank from becoming involved in its complications. I would much have preferred a more manageable job. It so happened, however, that some years earlier I had spent a summer semester in Germany, studying at Halle and attending the lectures of Professor Gustav Warneck, the first professor of missions to be appointed by any university. I continued to read German missionary literature, and was interested in the German outlook, which differed to a considerable degree from the Anglo-Saxon. When the appointment of a Continuation Committee hung in the balance at Edinburgh, the German delegation asked to see me and said that, though in principle they were in favor of the appointment of a Continuation Committee they feared that, in such an organization, they would be swamped by the larger, wealthier Anglo-Saxon missionary societies, and that this fear was shared by some of the other continental missions. They told me that the only thing that would relieve them from their anxieties would be my consent to accept the secretaryship, since I had given evidence that I understood the continental point of view.

I also had a conversation with Dr. Frere, at that time the head of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, and later Bishop of Truro, in which he told me that to take part in a permanent organization was, for the Anglo-Catholics, a bigger and more serious step than to participate in a particular conference. He went on to say that in the two years of preparatory work some of them had got to know me and realized that I understood and respected their point of view; if I agreed to become secretary, they would join in, but they would not give their trust to a man whom they did not know. I was thus put in a position which made refusal of the post very difficult. In particular, I was influenced by the fact that, if the Continuation Committee was formed, Mott would certainly be asked to be its chairman, and the advantages of enlisting his tremendous

energies in the service of the missionary movement seemed to me so great a gain that I felt I had no choice but to accept the office.

The appointment by the Conference of a Continuation Committee (to give place later, as was intended from the first, to the International Missionary Council) was in my view the decisive event which made possible the growth of the ecumenical movement. It is difficult to convey to readers today how great the innovation was. Up to that time conferences had met, passed resolutions, and dispersed, leaving no machinery for giving effect to the resolutions. The Edinburgh Conference set up a permanent body to carry forward its work, and provided it with a budget and secretariat. This established a precedent. There were already in existence interdenominational organizations, like The Young Men's Christian Association and the World's Student Christian Federation, with whole-time officers. But these organizations brought together *individuals* belonging to the differing denominations. The Edinburgh Conference was the first occasion in the international field in which a group of religious bodies set up machinery to carry out tasks which they wanted themselves to undertake in common. I am not sure whether the Foreign Missions Conference in North America had yet more than a part-time secretary to conduct its affairs. The Federal Council of Churches had already a whole-time secretary, but it was only a recent appointment. With these exceptions I was at the time of my appointment the only person in the sphere of the Churches undertaking the *kind* of job to which I was called.

III

Toward the close of the First World War I was in touch with some of the younger men, e.g. Lionel Curtis and Philip Kerr (later Lord Lothian) in Great Britain and Whitney Shephardson in America, who took an active part in the formation of the League of Nations. The core of the proposition was in their view the appointment of an international body *with a budget and secretariat*. This constitutional step, which they felt to be so essential in the international sphere, had been taken by the Edinburgh Conference eight years earlier and, in so far as human agency is concerned, it had been due to the imagination and driving power of one man—John R. Mott.

Apart from a small participation of the Younger Churches, which increased as the years passed, the International Missionary Council was composed of representatives both of mission *boards*, which were departments of the churches, officially set up by them, and representatives of

missionary *societies* which, though belonging for the most part to one particular denomination, were voluntary organizations within it. The latter type probably was the larger. Nevertheless, in so far as there is a difference in outlook between the types, it was that of the church boards which from the beginning dominated the outlook of the International Missionary Council. That is to say, the ecclesiastical sense in the best meaning of the term was always present in its deliberations. This was due to the influence in the Continuation Committee and in its successor, the International Missionary Council, of powerful personalities like Silas McBee, whose thinking was dominated from first to last by the vision of a World Council of Churches, and of such great ecclesiastical statesmen as Bishop Talbot of Winchester and Dr. Frank Mason North, who was the president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Dr. North used frequently in conversation with me to express his anxiety about what he regarded as the Y.M.C.A. streak in Mott's composition. Mott certainly did not have in any degree the ecclesiastical mind, but he had an almost unerring judgment of men, and he recognized instinctively the importance of ecclesiastical leaders whom he must carry with him if the enterprises in which he was engaged were to succeed. In my own case I have never been drawn to mix myself up too closely in ecclesiastical affairs and have been inclined by temperament to concern myself more with matters on the frontier between the Church and the World. But I have always had a genuine admiration for the quality of ecclesiastical statesmanship and it was my good fortune in my early days to be brought into contact with examples of it in its highest forms.

This outlook, characteristic of the International Missionary Council, has not, I think, been given sufficient emphasis in accounts of the ecumenical movement but it is of some historical importance. Though the International Missionary Council was composed of the representatives, not of the Churches themselves, but of their missionary boards and of missionary societies, whereas the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work was composed in part of representatives of the Churches themselves, the principles on which the World Council of Churches is based were more clearly understood by the I.M.C. than by Life and Work.

This is a personal judgment, but it is based on first-hand and intimate experience of both organizations. For three years I was chairman (and for the latter part of the period practically a whole-time chairman) of the Commission set up by the Life and Work Movement to prepare for the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State in 1937. In that

capacity I served as secretary (or joint secretary) of the Committee of Thirty-five, the Committee of Fourteen, and the Utrecht Conference, which in succession drew up the plans for the World Council of Churches. The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work included a number of leading churchmen appointed by the Churches, or exercising great weight in the counsels of the Churches, to which they belonged—such as the late Bishop of Chichester, M. Marc Boegner, Professor William Adams Brown and others of similar standing. But it also included quite a number of individuals, like myself, who were not only not appointed by the Churches of which we were members, but had no voice in their controlling bodies. This constitutional ambiguity in the set-up in the Universal Christian Council was further emphasized by its close association with the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches which, in its preponderant American section, was not based on official representation of the Churches at all.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft a few years ago wrote an article in which he expounded with great clarity the principles on which the World Council of Churches is based. He said that these principles received clear recognition for the first time at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948. This was certainly true so far as the Life and Work Movement is concerned. But the principle on which he rightly laid the greatest stress, that the World Council of Churches is nothing and can do nothing apart from the Churches which constitute it, had been adopted by the International Missionary Council thirty years earlier. The International Missionary Council included in its constitution a clause to the effect that the only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the missionary societies and boards and the Churches in the mission field. This article was put into the constitution with the precise intention of making it clear that the International Missionary Council had no existence, and could decide nothing, apart from its constituent bodies. The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work had no such clause in its constitution. It could not have introduced one without radical changes in the constitution. These became possible only when the World Council of Churches was established on a new basis.

The concluding paragraphs of this article have been written as a tribute to the memory of the men of large stature and high statesmanship who gave their services to the ecumenical movement in its early beginnings and guided it safely past many rocks on which it might have foundered.

2. Edinburgh, 1910—Ecumenical Keystone

WILLIAM RICHEY HOGG

THE WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE held at Edinburgh in June, 1910, has been described as a turning point, a lens, a landmark, and a watershed. Widespread use of these and similarly descriptive words points to "Edinburgh, 1910" as a unique event with a crucial relationship to what lay behind it as well as to that which followed it. That conference now stands a half-century in the past. Yet instead of receding from sight, it looms constantly larger in importance. How is it to be assessed today?

Edinburgh, 1910, appears to be the non-Roman Christian world's ecumenical keystone. The keystone, specially cut, stands as the central stone at the crown of an arch. It holds together and strengthens all beneath that converges in it. The arch it crowns provides a foundation upon which a superstructure can be built. The keystone is neither arch nor wall, but it belongs to both. Remove it, and both will collapse. It is unique. Thus it is with Edinburgh, 1910. It belongs to the nineteenth and to the twentieth centuries. It is the keystone through which developments in mission and unity in the one century relate to those in the other and apart from which the full meaning of neither can be assayed. We turn first to the Edinburgh Conference's nineteenth-century background.

I. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Although there had been a few Protestant missions before William Carey's time, and with the Moravians a notable exception, these operated within a colonial context and in part reflected the pre-Reformation notion that the ruler is responsible for Christianity (and thus missions) within his dominions. Carey founded in England what was later to be called the Baptist Missionary Society and then sailed for India in 1793. He marks the beginning of the modern voluntary missionary society (and slightly later the missionary board as an integral part of a denomination) whose

WILLIAM RICHEY HOGG, B.D., Ph.D., is Associate Professor of World Christianity at Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. His many writings in the ecumenical field include *Ecumenical Foundations*, Harper & Brothers, 1952, and *One World—One Mission*, 1960, interdenominational missions study book for 1960-1961.

purview and concern on theological grounds were not colonial but world-wide. Thus Carey stands as the pioneer of modern Protestant missions. Inspired in no small measure by Carey's vision and example, European and North American Protestants between 1795 and 1850 created the majority of the large missionary sending agencies that operate today.

From India in 1806, Carey proposed the decennial convening of an international and interdenominational world missionary conference. The first gathering, he suggested, should meet at Capetown in 1810. The city had obvious advantages, being a center to which those from Europe, the Americas, and Asia could come with roughly equal travel-distances. Carey, a man of catholic understanding, viewed this assembly as "a general association of all denominations of Christians from the four quarters of the world." Such decennial conferences, he believed, would bring greater mutuality and understanding and a larger view of the common missionary task than was possible through correspondence.

When Carey made his proposal, the first overseas sending agency in the United States was yet to be formed. Except for the Moravians, none of the great German societies had been founded. In Britain the Church Missionary Society had just begun to send out missionaries, most of them German Lutheran Pietist volunteers. But William Carey was a statesman. He knew how the tide was moving. He clearly saw what Protestant missions needed. Yet his proposal was dismissed as a "pleasing dream." A century later the wisdom of Carey's plan was acknowledged by its fulfillment at Edinburgh.

Imperialism's High Tide. European imperial outreach began in the mid-fifteenth century when, seeking a route to Asia, the Portuguese began exploring Africa's western coast. By the early sixteenth century Spain and Portugal had spanned the world, claimed vast new territories, and launched Roman Catholic missions on their greatest period of expansion. Yet the Spanish Armada's defeat in 1588 marked the beginning of the end of Iberian imperial supremacy, and the first emergence of the Northern European Protestant countries on their long road to imperial dominance. Roman Catholic missions sharply felt the decline of Iberian power, but other reasons also help to account for the low ebb they reached in the early years of the nineteenth century. The same period marked the emergence of Protestant world missions with steadily increasing force.

Western European colonial expansion reached its high point in the second half of the nineteenth century. At the century's beginning, for example, Britain had just lost the United States but was the dominant

power in Canada and held India. Among other possessions the Netherlands held what is today Indonesia. By mid-century China and Japan had been opened to the West. In the century's final quarter the European powers divided Africa among themselves. In the same years Korea was opened to the West, and the Philippines came under the control of the United States. In the pre-1914 period Western ideas and technology were making a tremendous impact upon the non-Western world.

Nineteenth-Century Protestant Missions. The nineteenth century was for Protestant missions a period of enormous and diverse expansion. In 1815, Protestant missionaries probably numbered no more than 300 persons. By 1910, some 21,000 were serving overseas—half of them women. In 1815, there may have been three missionary doctors. By 1910, there were more than 1,000—a third of them women. China and India, the two most populous nations on earth, are lands of ancient and high civilizations and religions. By 1910, the majority of Protestant overseas medical and educational institutions and personnel were concentrated in them. Yet missionaries also moved in large numbers among less advanced peoples. To enable men to read the Bible missionaries reduced to writing in Romanized script hundreds of languages—more by 1900 than had been put into writing in all the centuries of human experience before 1800. Often working with the Bible Societies, they translated the Bible or parts of it by 1914 into more than 500 tongues. Missionaries planted and nurtured Protestant churches in nearly every land on earth. Moreover, within the century the Protestant understanding of Christian missions was transformed. Until Carey's time there was, practically speaking, no Protestant recognition that the Christian gospel involves a missionary obligation to all the earth's peoples. By the end of the century this obligation was generally recognized by the Protestant Churches.

The rise of Protestant missions coincided with the peak of Western European imperial expansion. Yet unlike the sixteenth century Iberian monarchs, Protestant rulers in the nineteenth century did not finance missions in their colonial possessions. When, for example, partial subsidies to Christian schools were given, they were made for the educational welfare of colonial subjects rather than to encourage the spread of the Christian faith. To be sure, Lutheran missions usually flourished best in German territories, even as Anglican missions seemed to thrive best in British territories. Yet as Latourette has shown, Protestant missions in the nineteenth century were more independent of governments and more critical of colonial policies than in any century since the fourth. Moreover, by

1910, probably a majority of Protestant missionaries were at work in lands where their home governments had no control. What issued from these facts encouraged a new understanding—with distinctly different presuppositions from those underlying the old European notion of Christendom—of non-Roman Christians as a minority community among the earth's peoples but as a closely knit, trans-national, world-wide fellowship. The meaning of this for the church was seen *in part* and enunciated at Edinburgh, 1910. Precisely here future historians may see in Edinburgh another of the great dividing points in the history of Christianity as a world faith.

Four Contributing Streams. With this brief sketch of nineteenth-century missionary expansion, one can better appraise four separate but related developments that converged in 1910 to make the World Missionary Conference what it was.

The first of these was the emergence of co-operative conferences in China, India, Japan, South Africa, Mexico, and elsewhere, in which missionaries came together for consultation and counsel concerning their common task. These conferences met locally, regionally, and nationally. From them issued a pattern of broad co-operative planning, joint endeavors (*e.g.*, in medicine, education, Bible translation, and production of literature), a greatly heightened sense of Christian unity, and widely acknowledged need "on the field" to face the issues of church union.

For Edinburgh, 1910, the most important of these gatherings were the South India Conference at Madras in 1900, the all-India Decennial Conference at Madras in 1902, and the Centenary Conference of Christian Missions in China at Shanghai in 1907. The latter two were patterned on Madras, 1900, which marked a sharp break with all previous missionary conferences. Each of the three was a working conference with thorough committee studies and reports prepared in advance. Each had official delegates elected on a proportional basis by the co-operating missionary agencies. None allowed theological questions to be raised on which the assembled denominations had major differences. In plenary sessions those who wished the floor had to notify the chairman by card, await recognition, and then speak within a time limit. These three gatherings, carefully studied by those responsible for Edinburgh, 1910, shaped that assembly and all subsequent ecumenical conferences.

The second stream comprised a series of conferences held in England and America. These began in New York and London in 1854 and culminated in the Ecumenical Missionary Conference in New York in 1900. Increasingly these gatherings became missionary demonstrations primarily

for the encouragement and education of the "home constituency." They disclosed a growing sense of unity and a frequently repeated desire for what the International Missionary Council became. Indeed, at London in 1888, Gustav Warneck of Germany outlined a proposal for such a body and suggested that it sponsor a great international missionary conference decennially.

The third contributing stream was the development of continuing bodies for missionary co-operation in Europe and North America. Among several of these, the most important for Edinburgh, 1910, were the Continental Missions Conference (1866 ff.), the Standing Committee (*Ausschuss*) of the German Protestant Missionary Societies (1885 ff.), and the Foreign Missions Conference of North America (1893 ff.), now the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of Churches. From these came important interdenominational ties, experience in dealing unitedly with governments, and the principle—first enunciated by the *Ausschuss* and later adopted by the Foreign Missions Conference—that the co-operative agency is the creation of the societies and boards (and thus of the churches) which alone have the right to determine missionary policy.

Implicit in that principle are two important considerations. First, the co-operative agency must respect the convictions of each of its member bodies and has authority only in so far as its counsel by its inherent wisdom commends itself to the member agencies. Second, involved here in principle is recognition that these agencies belong to the churches and are *interdenominational* rather than being independent, *non-denominational* structures. This understanding was later embodied in the Edinburgh Continuation Committee, the national Christian councils, the International Missionary Council, and the World Council of Churches. Indeed, here in germinal form from the standpoint of organization is the genius of Protestant-Orthodox ecumenical co-operation.

The fourth stream consisted of all that is embodied in the international Student Christian Movement—the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the national Student Christian Movements, the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, and drawing all these together, the World's Student Christian Federation (1895 ff.). In these John R. Mott, J. H. Oldham, and others gained invaluable experience and insight. In Federation meetings, students never hesitated to discuss thorny theological questions. Moreover, they did so within a denominationally more inclusive context than was to be found in the missionary conferences. In the Federation's World Meeting at Tokyo in 1907 students from Asia outnumbered those

from Europe and North America three to one. In the representation of nationals, this contrasted sharply with the missionary conferences in Asia. The most dynamic shaping influence behind Edinburgh, 1910, came from the Student Christian Movement.¹

II. THE WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE, 1910

The World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh from June 14 to 23, 1910, was originally designated The Third Ecumenical Missionary Conference. London, 1888, and New York, 1900, were viewed as its two immediate predecessors. Yet the very inclusiveness of the conference resulted in rejection of the word "ecumenical." It was judged to have certain technical theological connotations not appropriate to the meeting that was planned. The idea for the conference emerged because of the widely accepted idea of decennial world missionary gatherings. Indeed, proposals for its convening arose almost simultaneously in the United States, Scotland, and Germany.²

Edinburgh, 1910, was a soul-stirring gathering. More than 1,200 official delegates attended, including seventeen from the churches of India, Burma, China, Japan, and Korea who came as members of missionary society delegations. More than any others, Mott and Oldham had shaped the conference. It moved with smooth and dynamic precision. Dr. Mott was its chairman, Dr. Oldham its secretary. When the conference worked—and it had a broad agenda for which eight volumes had been prepared on the problems of the Christian mission in the non-Christian world—it did so rapidly and with assurance under Dr. Mott's guiding hand. Yet when the conference ceased its work to worship and pray, as it did each morning, noon, and evening, there were moments when, as Temple Gairdner wrote, the very "silence of God was *heard* within the hall."³

Seen from one vantage point, Edinburgh, 1910, was essentially an assessment of foreign missions from the Western missionary's perspective. Yet Edinburgh was incomparably more than this. Edinburgh's "one creative act" was the formation of its Continuation Committee to carry on at the international level all that Edinburgh represented and had begun. That body in 1921 became the International Missionary Council which,

¹ On all the above, see W. R. Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations*, Harper & Brothers, 1952, Ch. II.

² *Ibid.*, 47, 48, 101-109. Tislington Tatlow's statement (made first in his *The Story of the Student Christian Movement*) that at New York in 1900 it was "decided that a decade later another conference in the international decennial series should take place . . . at Edinburgh" is in error. See Ruth Rouse and Stephen C. Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, London: S.P.C.K., 1954, p. 405.

³ For more detailed accounts of the conference see Rouse and Neill, *op. cit.*, pp. 355-362, and Hogg, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-142, 374-375.

presumably, in 1961 will be integrated with the World Council of Churches. Yet Edinburgh represented much more than the organizational developments that emerged from it. There were those present who with the intuitive insight of soul-perception knew that in a unique way the power of God's Holy Spirit had been in their midst to bring to fulfillment his own purpose in ways beyond their imagining. The interior meaning of Edinburgh, 1910, is increasingly seen in this light.

III. EDINBURGH'S SIGNIFICANCE

Edinburgh's significance has been variously assessed. The Conference stimulated interest in missions and resulted in increased missionary giving. It encouraged the founding of at least several schools in North America (*e.g.*, the Kennedy School of Missions) and in the non-Western World. Other similar immediate results could be traced, but they fail to reflect that gathering's larger meaning.

One facet of this fuller appraisal involves the elemental fact that Edinburgh met and that it met when it did, on the eve of World War I. That war was a symptom of a deep illness in our contemporary civilization, and as yet neither the disease nor its manifestations have disappeared. No small part of Edinburgh's meaning resides in its having occurred in a critical, transitional moment of history. Between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Edinburgh, 1910, stands as a key-link in mankind's "inner history"—the total mission of God's covenanted people in the world.

Second, Edinburgh, 1910, gained incalculable significance through its impact upon the lives of certain men. Obviously this can in no way be adequately assessed. Yet reference to a few names may convey some idea of its shaping influences. Mott and Oldham contributed greatly to Edinburgh. At the same time, Edinburgh gave them enlarged vision, understanding, and purpose. Consider Edinburgh's impact upon V. S. Azariah, two years later the first Indian Anglican bishop, soon thereafter the prime mover in those developments that led to the Church of South India, and then chairman of the National Christian Council of India. Or, ponder its meaning for Cheng Ching-yi, leader and moderator in the Church of Christ in China. How can one plumb the depth of the influence of the Edinburgh experience on the lives of those young men appointed as conference ushers? William Temple was present in this capacity. May not his oft-quoted enthronement sermon of 1942 and all that it symbolized of ecumenical dedication have had its roots in Edinburgh? John Baillie was an usher, and Otto Dibelius attended in an equally inconspicuous

role with the German delegations. Among others appointed ushers or stewards were William Paton, J. McLeod Campbell, Kenneth Kirk, William Manson, and Walter Moberly. Through hundreds of lives—among them the Archbishop of Canterbury, the China Inland Mission delegation, professors of theology, missionaries, and statesmen—Edinburgh made its impact felt.

Third, Edinburgh contributed directly and indirectly to the emergence of some of the most important ecumenical structures in the twentieth century. In the process of strengthening Edinburgh's direct offspring, known by 1921 as the International Missionary Council, Dr. Mott aided in creating national Christian councils throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Through the I.M.C. these were joined with missionary councils in the West and provided a world-wide network of Christian councils. Moreover, through the Anglican missionary bishop, Charles R. Brent, Edinburgh contributed to the founding of the Faith and Order Movement. Edinburgh also led to the creation in 1913 of the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America.

In a unique way Edinburgh prepared the way for the World Council of Churches. (a) Although it was not the first to employ them, Edinburgh established three ecumenical operating principles: convening only *officially* appointed delegates; maintaining broad denominational inclusiveness, rather than limiting membership to "evangelical" Protestants; operating co-operatively on essential tasks without requiring a detailed prior theological consensus, but also without compromising any conviction. (b) Edinburgh and its organizational outgrowth demonstrated the value of and need for a full-time paid secretariat in ecumenical work. (c) Through its working principles, its example, and especially through the work of Oldham, Edinburgh and its offspring contributed to the Life and Work Movement. (d) Edinburgh, 1910, gave rise to the Faith and Order Movement. (e) Edinburgh, 1910, brought British, American, and Continental Christians together in major shared endeavors just before World War I. When that bitter war ended, the organization that rooted in the World Missionary Conference restored those earlier ties and greatly facilitated the rapid development of ecumenicity in the 1920's. (f) Edinburgh gave rise to the International Missionary Council. From 1921 onward and for nearly three decades that body was the major world-wide, interdenominational agency linking Christians on every continent and providing the "younger churches," on the basis of full equality, experience in ecumenical encounter.

Moreover, in the process of forming the International Missionary

Council, it was apparent to Oldham, and he clearly stated his conviction, that a world council of churches was imperative. Indeed, by its very existence and its limitations the International Missionary Council pointed beyond itself to a world council of churches. With Faith and Order, and Life and Work, the International Missionary Council indicated need not only for a new organization, but also for a new and larger understanding of the church. Finally, in bringing the non-Western churches into the thought-world and the life of the Western churches, and in preparing non-Western churchmen in ecumenical conversation and administration, Edinburgh and its lengthened shadow, the International Missionary Council, immeasurably strengthened and helped bring to maturity the "younger churches." This enabled the World Council of Churches when it was founded in 1948 to be a *world* body rather than one primarily European. Thus did Edinburgh, 1910, and all that flowed from it contribute to the World Council of Churches.

Fourth, while those at Edinburgh would not have phrased it so, the World Missionary Conference was a gathering concerned with the church. One must not dismiss that judgment too speedily on the basis of today's presuppositions concerning church and mission. Edinburgh reflected the late nineteenth-century field conferences' growing concern for "The Church of Christ in China," or "The Church of Christ in Japan," or "The Church of Christ in India." Although probably a majority of missionaries viewed devolution as far in the future, many in the pre-1910 field conferences were actively committed to and vocal about the rapid attainment of strong, united, national churches. This also appeared at Edinburgh.

Edinburgh, 1910, is usually described as a "home-base" conference surveying overseas missions. This is true. But equally true is the fact that Edinburgh was deeply and directly involved with *the church* of "the mission field." Some of Edinburgh's Continental interpreters seem to have been almost unaware of this. Indeed, it may not be without significance to recall that not one non-Western Christian was included in the delegations of the Continental societies. The British sent four nationals. The American boards sent thirteen. The Baptists (Northern) included five nationals, one an Indian missionary working in Africa. One of each eight of its delegates represented Asian churches. The Presbyterians (Northern) sent four nationals. For some at least the "younger churches" held real importance.

Edinburgh, 1910, acknowledged that it was confronting not scattered

colonies of converts under a few missionaries, but the reality of the church. Indeed, the Commission II Report surveys *The Church in the Mission Field*. The very phrasing marks an advance. The commission explicitly repudiated the old phrase, "the native church," and indicated that its own phrasing was not altogether satisfactory. Further insight can be gained from the commission chairman's introduction of the Report on the conference floor. After emphasizing the "epoch-making fact" of the "corporate life of the young Church," he went on to say: "... We desire the conference to recognize the enormous force that exists, now established in the very heart of the pagan world, in the young Christian Church which missions have founded, but which is itself now the great mission to the non-Christian world."⁴ Clearly, Edinburgh was reaching toward a new understanding of the church in its mission in the world.⁵

Fifth, Edinburgh, 1910, was concerned not only with the church, but also with the unity of the church! Commission VIII dealt with "Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity." It faced thoroughly and honestly all forms of co-operation among Christians overseas and at the home base. It surveyed efforts toward federation and progress in actual union.⁶ It assessed two dominant views of church union (and sounds remarkably up to date) and encouraged all movements toward church unions on "the mission field." It acknowledged that with the world physically one and with the divine intention that the church be one, concern for Christian unity in Asia and Africa is freighted with meaning for the church in the West. In this context, the official report specified mission and unity as "the concern of the whole Church of Christ."⁷ This same commission report recommended the Continuation Committee.

Edinburgh eliminated questions of faith and order from its discussions. This was right and necessary. Yet, as so often happens, what was debarred kept pressing to the fore. Edinburgh's participants openly acknowledged that in dealing with the Christian mission they were involved in the life and nature of the church. This recognition forced the further acknowledgment that one cannot talk about the whole church and its mission with-

⁴ *World Missionary Conference*, Vol. II, pp. 340, 341.

⁵ Wilhelm Andersen's excellent study, *Towards a Theology of Mission: A Study of the Encounter between the Missionary Enterprise and the Church and Its Theology*, here (pp. 17-18) seems to overlook some really new ground that was being taken at Edinburgh. Andersen's basic thesis is true, namely, that from Edinburgh, 1910, to Willingen, 1952, the missionary enterprise increasingly encountered the church and that in the process there has been emerging a theology of mission. But there is much more "encounter with the church" at Edinburgh, 1910, than he indicates.

⁶ Cf. *World Missionary Conference*, 1910, Vol. VIII, pp. 83-118, 131-148.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

out facing quite frankly all that is involved in faith and order discussions.

Edinburgh was not constituted to deal with these considerations, but it knew that it confronted the problems of Christian unity and church union. A Chinese delivered one of Edinburgh's most memorable addresses and pleaded for the union of China's churches.⁸ Anglicans and non-Anglicans alike recognized and stated that the fullness of the union to which many were referring included not only those Christians represented at Edinburgh, but also Roman Catholics and Orthodox. Indeed, when Wardlaw Thompson, a British Congregationalist, addressed the assembly, he said that he looked forward to the day when a conference could be held to consider theological matters on which the delegates disagreed—questions "very properly tabooed" in 1910—to lead the churches into fuller truth. In his hopes for this future discussion he included the Roman Catholics and the Orthodox.⁹

The following evening, with only one day of the conference remaining, Bishop Charles R. Brent made a formal address on "The Sufficiency of God." In it he declared:

During these days a new vision has been unfolded to us. . . . In addition to the fresh tasks . . . now confronting us, there rises that ultimate ideal . . . which somehow we feel to be part of our responsibility. . . . Our ideal as it is in our minds [is] to achieve a perfect unity, not merely the unity of those various portions of Christendom here represented, but the whole of Christendom. . . . That is the task before us. Let us be satisfied with nothing less.¹⁰

Edinburgh's report on co-operation and unity stated that the greatest need was "for apostles of unity." In his interpretation of Edinburgh, 1910, immediately afterward, Brent described himself as having been made there an "apostle of Church unity." He hoped that the World Missionary Conference would lead to church union. His diary records that in October, 1910, on the opening morning of the Convocation of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Cincinnati, there came upon him the conviction that a

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 195-197.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 215-216.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. IX, pp. 330-334. For Edinburgh's formal addresses manuscripts were available. All other statements made by delegates from the floor were stenographically reported and are included in *World Missionary Conference, 1910*. Oldham edited these volumes immediately after the conference.

More than a decade ago the writer combed the Edinburgh volumes for Brent's speech that Oldham elsewhere in this issue indicates he clearly remembers. The writer made a similar re-examination for this article. Both searches led to the same judgment: if the speech was made at Edinburgh, it seems not to have been included in the record. This is, of course, entirely possible; but since Oldham was the editor, it presents a curious situation. Wardlaw Thompson's statement referred to above is similar in part to what Oldham recalls Brent as having said. (Brent's statement during the discussion on co-operation and unity relates to the Roman Catholic Church. *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 198-199.)

Cf. Hogg, *op. cit.*, pp. 133, 134, 398; Rouse and Neill, *op. cit.*, pp. 360, 361, 407; and Brent, "The World Missionary Conference—An Interpretation," *The East and the West*, Vol. VIII (1910), pp. 364 ff.

world conference on faith and order should be convened. Thus did the World Missionary Conference through Charles R. Brent lead to the Faith and Order Movement and to a major concern within the ecumenical conversation for Christian unity and church union.

IV. THE LARGER CONTEXT

On more than one occasion the writer has tried to assess the significance of Edinburgh, 1910. In the attempt he is always driven back to a question: "Can one imagine the state of the non-Roman Christian world today if Edinburgh, 1910, and all that issued from it had never occurred?" Perhaps only reflection on the meaning of the question and the answers that could be given to it can bring one at present to some adequate appraisal of this keystone event in Christian history.

There is, however, a larger setting to which Edinburgh even now can dimly be seen to belong. The emergence of conversations and new understanding between Roman Catholics and other Christians, the remarkable growth of strong ties among Protestants and between Protestants and Orthodox, and the widespread posing by Christians everywhere of the question, "What does it mean to be a member of Christ's church in the world today?" point to one fact: there is a ferment, a growing self-understanding, and a concern for unity among all Christian people that is new and unique in our time. Indeed, one affirms in faith that what is happening results from the work of the Holy Spirit. Is it too much to suggest that we are already in process of entering a new era in Christianity's history in terms of the total body of Christians' confronting their oneness in Christ and also the question of their relationship with those of the great non-Christian faiths (not all of which are "traditional faiths")?

Future historians, tracing developments in Christian unity, may discover that ours has been a century of notable and related Christian councils. These include the Vatican Council of 1870, The World Missionary Conference of 1910, the Conference of Orthodox Churches of 1948, The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1948, The East Asia Christian Conference of 1957, and the coming Roman Ecumenical Council.

The *Vatican Council of 1869-70* symbolized the world community of Roman Catholicism under the supreme administrative power and *ex cathedra* doctrinal infallibility of the Pope. It involved the issue of authority in the church and pointed to future councils for Rome as perhaps useful, but not essential in the definition of dogma. A generation later, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910* brought together

non-Roman, non-Orthodox bodies to consider the Christian mission. In the process, they discovered that implicit in and essential to their discussion is the larger question of the whole church in its mission and its unity.

Another generation later, *The Conference of Orthodox Churches, Moscow, 1948*¹¹ reflected the uncertain state of *primus inter pares* authority among the Orthodox Churches and also the views of the Moscow Patriarchate toward the Roman Catholic Church, Anglican orders, and the then soon to be constituted World Council of Churches. In that same summer, *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Amsterdam, 1948* evidenced a new and unique form of relationship between Protestant and Orthodox Churches. Implicit in all that the World Council of Churches symbolizes is the acknowledgment that among those who recognize "Jesus Christ as God and Savior" there can be in this moment of history a close fellowship which itself points to a concern for the unity of the church.

Nearly a decade later, *The East Asia Christian Conference, Prapat, Indonesia, 1957* became the first major assembly of non-Roman churches in lands outside the traditional limits of European "Christendom." That gathering centered on the mission and unity of the church in a revolutionary area. It demonstrated the full-orbed nature of the church's mission—a mission that proceeds not from the West nor from a Western church, but from the church to the world wherever the church exists.

The Roman Catholic Ecumenical Council, at Rome in the early 1960's, will represent in Roman eyes the whole church in the whole world, but not all "separated Christians." Within its purview will be all subjects related to the welfare of the church. Yet throughout the world men anticipate the council primarily because of its focus on church unity and the possibility of closer rapprochement between Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy. The latter would involve theological difficulties of the first magnitude and also important political and ecclesiastical implications.

Thus briefly and inadequately is the church-council profile of a century drawn. Adequate assessment of meanings and relationships belongs to those of future centuries. Yet it is important *now* to recognize that, despite their seemingly disparate nature and perspectives, each gathering has been concerned with the unity of the Christian church. The writer, with all due hesitation, ventures the judgment that among these, Edinburgh, 1910, in the long sweep of Christian history, may well prove to have been germinally the most creative and influential of all.

¹¹ The Finnish Church did not attend. Representatives of the Patriarch in Constantinople and of the Greek Church attended the celebrations but not the voting sessions.

3. Developments in the "Younger Churches" Since Edinburgh, 1910

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

SOME OF THE MOST striking developments in world-wide Christianity in the rapidly moving years since Edinburgh, 1910, have been in Asia, Africa, the Islands of the Pacific, and Latin America—in what we are accustomed to call, not with entire accuracy, the "younger churches." As is well known, the World Missionary Conference of that place and year assumed that the burden for the world mission must rest primarily, indeed almost exclusively, upon the "older churches" of Europe and North America. In the brilliant galaxy at Edinburgh, less than 2 per cent were "nationals" from Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the island countries, and they came, not as official representatives of the churches of those lands, but as delegates of Western missionary societies. To be sure, they made an impression on the gathering far out of proportion to their numbers, and the far-sighted leaders of the conference were already envisioning the larger participation of the "younger churches" in carrying the gospel to the world. But the fact remains that the gathering was overwhelmingly Occidental and one of its major emphases was on the recruiting and training of missionaries from the West, since on them, so it was believed, must rest the main responsibility for fulfilling the Great Commission.

In the half century since the conference adjourned, the situation has been revolutionized. The "younger churches" have grown both in numbers and in their share in the planning and execution of the world mission. One of the "younger churchmen" is now chairman of the International Missionary Council, another is chairman of the World's Student Christian Federation, still another is president of the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, and the presidium of the World Council of Churches has included three of them.

The change is in part due to alterations in the West. Here the disasters of two world wars and the progressive secularization of much of Europe

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, Ph.D., D.D., Litt.D., LL.D., is Sterling Professor of Missions and Oriental History, Emeritus, of Yale University. Author of the seven-volume *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, he has now completed two volumes of his new five-volume series, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age*.

have greatly weakened what fifty years ago we were accustomed to call the "home base" and have altered the proportions and the nature of the contribution of the "older churches." The percentage of missionaries and of financial contributions from Europe in the support of the missionary enterprise has strikingly declined. The mounting majority of both are now from North America—the United States and Canada. Much of the vision and constructive thinking are still from Europe, but in other respects the participation of that part of the Occident has sharply fallen. Moreover, the complexion of the contribution from North America, and especially from the United States, has been significantly altered. In 1910 the large majority of the missionaries from the United States came from societies represented at Edinburgh. Now approximately half are from bodies which do not co-operate with the ecumenical instrument which emerged from Edinburgh, the International Missionary Council.

Here is a thought-provoking contrast to what has happened in the Roman Catholic Church. The overwhelming majority of that church's missionaries and almost all of its constructive thinking on the world mission have Europe as their source. From France still come more Roman Catholic missionaries than from any other country, and Belgium and The Netherlands are not far behind; and that in spite of the fact that these three lands have suffered fully as much from the world wars and from the threat of secularization as have the European countries in which Protestants are in the majority. Here is not the place to delve into the causes and the portent of the contrast, but it is of major significance.

The shift of emphasis to the "younger churches" has also come as a phase of the waning of Western colonialism. Leadership in the world mission, both in the "younger" and the "older churches," has recognized that if Christianity is to be regarded as arising from the universal gospel and not as Occidental and therefore a tool of "colonialism," it must be firmly rooted in all nations and peoples and not be dependent merely on one section of mankind. In theory this was accepted long before 1910, and John R. Mott in the consultations in Asia which he convened as chairman of the Continuation Committee of Edinburgh saw to it that the "nationals" were more largely represented than they had been at Edinburgh and in earlier missionary conferences in that continent. Yet the impulse given by World War I to the rising tide of revolt against white domination made inescapable the writing on the wall.

Even more important has been the growth of the "younger churches" in numbers, self-consciousness, and vigor. That has been the result of the

deliberate purpose of many early as well as later missionaries, and still more of the inherent power of the gospel.

We must hasten to note that the growth of the "younger churches" in the past half-century has not been exclusively a Protestant phenomenon. It has also been seen in the Roman Catholic Church. As in Protestantism, that growth has been both in numbers and in indigenous leadership. It has also been due to the same factors which have operated in the Protestant phase of the world mission. Here too have been present the recognition that in the changing world picture we are at the end of the era of Western colonialism and that if the Church is to survive and grow it must have a clergy sprung from the soil and a literature adapted to the particular needs of each of the peoples among which it is hoped to have the Church rooted. Here also have been those who in earlier generations clearly perceived the importance of steps to this end and endeavored to take them. Here as well World War I and its aftermath of rampant nationalism and rebellion against colonialism gave a powerful impetus. Some of the Popes of the period, notably Pius XI, have accorded vigorous support to the policy, and a great Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the Dutch Redemptorist Willem van Rossum, in charge as he was of the immediate supervision of Roman Catholic missions, was insistent in his emphasis on an indigenous clergy and episcopate; and the slightly younger Celse Bénigne Louis Costantini, the first Apostolic Delegate to China and later Cardinal and Secretary of the Propaganda, stressed not only the preparation of clergy but also the creation of indigenous expressions in art of the central verities of the Christian faith.

In 1926 Rome dramatized the importance of an indigenous clergy by the consecration in St. Peter's by the Pope of six Chinese bishops, the first of that nation to be raised to that dignity, with a single exception in the seventeenth century. In 1946 a further step was taken by the creation of a hierarchy for China (one had been set up in India in the nineteenth century) and a Chinese bishop was given the cardinal's hat. By the mid-twentieth century all the bishops in Japan were natives of that empire. As recently as the 1930's the Apostolic Delegate to Africa viewed the appointment of an African to the episcopate as being far in the future, but since then an increasing number of Africans have been made bishops. Now in 1960 Rome has announced that an African, a Japanese, and a Filipino are to be created cardinals. In general, in the present century the Roman Catholic Church has been ahead of Protestantism in theological education in Asia and Africa. In a number of countries in those two conti-

nents Roman Catholics have also displayed a phenomenal numerical advance.

Marked as has been the growth of the Roman Catholic Church since 1910 in Africa and Asia in numbers and in an indigenous clergy, it has been paralleled by a phenomenal increase in Protestantism in both these respects, not only there but also in what had long been a preserve of that Church, Latin America.

I. AFRICA

Advance in Africa south of the Sahara has been uneven but spectacular. Numerically it has varied with the political complexion of the several sections. In most areas under British control Protestantism has been more prominent than Roman Catholicism. In the Belgian Congo both have displayed a striking growth, but the latter has outstripped the former. That has been partly because some Belgian administrations have favored Roman Catholics. The preference has arisen from the fact that Belgium is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic and the missionary energies of the Belgian Church, backed by a strikingly loyal constituency, have been mostly channeled to Belgium's only colony; while Protestant missions, almost entirely non-Belgian, have tended to be viewed by the ruling power as alien. It is in the Belgian Congo and the adjoining Ruanda-Urundi, under Belgian trusteeship, that the growth of the Roman Catholic Church in Africa in the present century has been most pronounced. In the extensive Portuguese possessions Protestant missions have been under severe handicaps, partly because they are Protestant and partly because they are non-Portuguese, while the Roman Catholic Church has failed to make marked headway because of the low vitality of that Church in the mother country.

In the Union of South Africa, where among the Bantu peoples Protestantism had larger numerical gains in the nineteenth century than anywhere else in Africa, the *apartheid* measures of the government have presented obstacles which are being intensified rather than lessened, and the proliferation of Bantu sects has made for weakness. Here, too, Roman Catholic missions, which were relatively negligible in the nineteenth century, have registered marked advances. In Uganda, where some of the most notable triumphs of the last quarter of the nineteenth century were seen both by Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, the formerly prosperous Anglican Communion, still strong, displays some of the weaknesses attendant upon being a third generation church. Much of its membership, nominally Christian by heredity, does not have the zeal or the conviction of the first generation, recruited as that was in the face of persecution and thrilled by the fresh discovery of the gospel.

Since the Protestantism of most of Africa south of the Sahara owed its inception and its early growth to missionaries from the British Isles and the Continent of Europe and since the two world wars and secularization have greatly reduced the missionary staffs from those sources, the infant churches, although most of them are growing in numbers, suffer from a decline in the aid which formerly came from those regions. In contrast, Roman Catholic missionary staffs continue to mount.

Protestant churches also labor under the handicap of an inadequate African body of clergy. The problem is aggravated by the difficulty of providing theological training adapted to the needs of Africa and by the separation of the professions of pastor and teacher. If prospective ordinands have their theological education through the medium of English, they experience difficulty in putting the faith in terms which can be comprehended by their parishioners. If their training is in a vernacular they are confronted by the paucity or even complete absence of literature in that language. In the early days of the mission the functions of pastor and teacher were usually combined. Latterly teaching has become specialized and is distinct from the pastorate. Since teaching is more honored by Africans and commands higher salaries, it has more prestige than the calling of the pastor and tends to enlist men of higher caliber. This works to the disadvantage of the churches.

In spite of hampering factors Protestant Christianity continues to spread in Africa and to take firmer roots. Its rootage has been demonstrated by the high quality of a number of African Christians, both clerical and lay. Co-operation among Protestants in meeting the common challenge has proceeded apace in such regional bodies as the Congo Protestant Council which was the outgrowth of the Congo Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference, and through the adoption of a common name, *l'Eglise du Christ au Congo*, by several of the missions. Even more significant has been the all-Africa Christian conference which convened in Ibadan, Nigeria, in January, 1958, the first of its kind and prevailingly African in membership and leadership. From it issued a continuing organization.

II. ASIA

In the Middle East, the homeland of Islam and the heart of the Moslem world, the picture is mixed and is not so heartening. Always the gospel faces a resistant Islam from which conversions are few. World War I was accompanied by massacres and deportations of Armenians in Turkey and of Nestorians in Iran, in both of which constituencies Protes-

tantism was formerly strong. Complications accompanying and following World War II, with the creation of Israel and mounting Arab nationalism, have also been a handicap. Yet co-operation among the Protestant forces has increased, partly through the coming into being of the Near East Christian Council, due directly to the Edinburgh meeting, and a comprehensive conference of those addressing themselves to Islam held in 1958. Although the totals are small in comparison with the populations involved, the last fifty years have witnessed accessions in Iran.

The past half century in India has seen the marked advance of Christianity. This has been in spite of and in part because of the mounting nationalism which has issued in political independence and has placed obstacles in the way of the entrance of missionaries from abroad. Missionaries continue to be admitted, but with a more careful and selective scrutiny of their precise assignments than when the land was still under the British *raj*. Numerically Christians, though still a minority, are a more considerable proportion of the population than when the Edinburgh gathering convened. In 1910 Christians—of the Syrian community, Roman Catholics, and Protestants—were about one out of a hundred of India's millions. Today, in spite of the explosion in population, about two out of a hundred are Christians. Although, because of their earlier entrance by about four centuries, Roman Catholics are approximately a third more numerous than Protestants, the latter have been increasing more rapidly, both percentage-wise and in totals.

Fully as significant is the increase in Indian leadership in the churches. It has been notable in the Roman Catholic Church, but it has been even more rapid in Protestant bodies. That is the more striking in view of the fact that the large majority of the Protestants have come from the depressed classes, presumably unfitted by agelong servile status to produce competent leadership. V. S. Azariah was the Indian who made a profound impression at Edinburgh. Not long after, he was consecrated as the first Indian in the Anglican episcopate. In that post he led his diocese in a remarkable evangelistic program. At present all the Methodist bishops in India are "nationals," and only about two years have passed since Rajah Manikam became the first Indian Lutheran bishop. In many other ways Indians are forging to the fore in Protestant churches and institutions—as bishops in the Church of South India, as heads of colleges, and in other capacities. They are also prominent in the ecumenical movement.

The movement toward unity in Indian Protestantism has been spectacular. Out of Edinburgh came the National Christian Council, now pre-

dominantly Indian in leadership. The Church of South India, a union consummated in 1947, is not only unique among the churches of the world in that it has brought together Anglicans and non-Anglicans, but also because it is the largest of the united bodies which have come into being among the "younger churches." A similar although numerically smaller body is in process of birth in North India. The five decades since Edinburgh have been marked by the increasing permeation of Indian life by Christian ideals. That has been outstanding in the impress of Christ on Gandhi and through him on the nation as a whole. Gandhi would not call himself a Christian, but was glad to acknowledge his debt to the teachings and example of Christ and to the Christian hymns which were a source of inspiration in his times of crisis. Nehru is frankly a secularist but has declared that in his ethics he seeks to embody Christian standards. The list could be greatly lengthened to include Indians less prominent in the public eye, but who, although not Christians, to a greater or less extent bear the impress of Christianity.

In the smaller countries of Southeast Asia a somewhat similar record has been made. Ceylon, at present displaying a burgeoning nationalism closely allied with a resurgent Buddhism, has produced men prominent in ecumenical circles and bids fair soon to see the consummation of a united church of three denominations. Burma, still struggling with the aftermath of foreign invasion during World War II and the problems of ensuing political independence, has the Karens as its strongest Christian center. These people, the largest non-Burman element in the country, owe their racial self-consciousness and their insistence on an honored status chiefly to Christianity. Indicative of the fashion in which the faith has taken rootage among the Karens is the fact that during the Japanese invasion when all missionaries were compelled to leave, the numbers of Karen Christians increased by several tens of thousands.

In Thailand, where the prevailing Buddhism has made the numerical increase of Christians, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, very slow, a united church has been formed of most of the various Protestant denominations represented, and the American Presbyterians, responsible for the majority in that church, have turned over full authority to it. In Vietnam Protestantism acquired its first continuing foothold the year after Edinburgh. Roman Catholics, now numbering fully a million and a half, and perhaps two million, a number representing about one in ten of the population and approximately double the total of 1910, saw the consecration of the first Annamese bishop in 1933. Others followed. In the face of the Communist

invasion and the political division of the country the Church has continued to give evidence of vitality.

The Christianity of Indonesia has demonstrated that, in the face of foreign invasion and in the severing of the political ties with The Netherlands, it is firmly planted and able to propagate the faith and produce its own leadership. What has been called the Protestant Church of Indonesia, the central nucleus of which was once a state church financially dependent on the colonial government, has displayed a vigorous life in spite of the removal of that prop. The great Batak church, even after the forced withdrawal of all missionaries, both German and Dutch, during World War II, gained about 400,000 members before contacts with Europeans were resumed. Now, fully independent and self-governing, it continues to grow, staffed by clergy from its own ranks. Indonesia has more baptized Protestant Christians than all the rest of East Asia.

In the face of a revitalized Roman Catholic Church and the destruction wrought by the Japanese invasion in World War II, Protestantism in the Philippines has continued to grow, both in numbers and in indigenous leadership. Here, too, a united church has come into being which embraces a large proportion of the Protestants.

One of the most heartening developments since Edinburgh has been the emergence of the East Asia Christian Conference. An effort to bring into co-operation the Protestants of that part of the world in giving the gospel to the huge non-Christian majority of the region, its origin goes back to a small meeting in Hong Kong in 1954. It took shape in a representative gathering at Prapat, Sumatra, in 1958, and held its first formal meeting in the spring of 1959 in Malaya. Even before it came into being missionaries had gone from Korea to Thailand, from the Philippines to Indonesia, and from India to Indonesia. The fact that it has arisen since World War II is evidence of the mounting vitality of the faith in an area which suffered acutely during that struggle.

The checkered and stormy course of Christianity in China since 1910 might well claim an entire article. Here we must content ourselves with the briefest mention. Before the full-scale Japanese invasion which began in 1937, both Protestants and Roman Catholics were growing in numbers and in indigenous leadership. As a sequel to Edinburgh the National Christian Council had come into being, enlisting the majority of the Protestants. The Church of Christ in China was formed, with a strong Presbyterian nucleus and with several other denominations participating. Chinese were being elected to the Anglican and Methodist episcopates and

in other ways were coming to the fore in the churches. Even during the tragic Japanese invasion Christians, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, continued to grow in numbers. The taking over of the mainland by the Communists was followed by the compulsory withdrawal of the missionaries from abroad and the attempt of the government to sever ties with Christians outside China. The Church has shown an amazing capacity to survive, but as these lines are written the Communists seem intent on its slow strangulation. Yet in Taiwan, under the tolerant Nationalist regime, Christianity has been advancing apace.

Since 1910 the churches in Korea have suffered almost as much as in China, but the faith has continued to grow in numbers and in indigenous leadership. Under Japanese rule increasing pressure was brought on the Christians to support the regime. After 1945 came the occupation of the North by Communism and then the Communist invasion of the South. Yet in the South Christians have multiplied. United action has not been fully achieved, but a National Christian Council, a fruit of Edinburgh, has functioned.

In Japan for several years the Church had to face rampant nationalism and the attempt to enforce conformity to state Shinto. These culminated in the restrictions brought by World War II and the destruction of much church property by enemy bombings. Before World War II the Japanese churches, strong in the urban middle class, were largely self-governing and self-supporting. A national Christian Council had arisen as an outcome of Edinburgh. During the war the Church of Christ in Japan was formed as a union of most of the Protestants. After the war some of the bodies which had joined in it withdrew, but it still enrolls the majority of the Protestants. The National Christian Council continues, bringing into co-operation both that body and several of the bodies which have not gone into the union. Although Christians constitute less than one-half of 1 per cent of the population, they exert an influence far out of proportion to their numbers.

III. LATIN AMERICA

In Latin America, Protestantism has had a phenomenal growth in the fifty years since Edinburgh. In 1910 it had only made a beginning in that erstwhile almost solidly Roman Catholic region. Since then it has become a continuing feature of every Latin American country. Some of that has been through immigration, notably in Brazil. Most of it has been from accessions from the nominally Roman Catholic population. The rate of increase has varied from country to country. In Brazil and Chile it has

been amazing. Much has been through missionaries from the United States. A large proportion of the missionaries are from bodies which are not associated with the International Missionary Council. By deliberate plan, Latin America was not represented at Edinburgh. That was because the Germans and the Anglicans opposed the inclusion of programs for winning converts from other Christian bodies. In 1913, to fill the gap, the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America was constituted to co-ordinate the efforts of the missionary societies of the United States and Canada. But a large proportion of the Protestants of Latin America are not officially related to it. For instance, the overwhelming majority of the Protestants in Chile, although sprung from the efforts of a Methodist missionary, are Pentecostals who have purely indigenous leadership and no formal relations with the ecumenical movement; and Pentecostals, with only slight foreign contacts, are increasing by leaps and bounds in Brazil and Argentina.

Yet Protestants are more and more being drawn into the ecumenical movement. For example, one of their number is currently on the presidium of the World Council of Churches, and in 1959 the Alliance of Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System met in Brazil. The past few years have also witnessed fresh currents of life among Roman Catholics in Latin America. Latin America has moved far in the direction of secularism, but Christianity in that vast area is unmistakably vital.

The prominence of bodies and of missions in Latin America that have not been drawn into the ecumenical movement which had Edinburgh, 1910, as a landmark points to a phase of the world mission at which we have hinted and which has assumed major proportions. In many areas in Africa, Asia, and Latin America missionaries who are not related to the International Missionary Council or the World Council of Churches have been multiplying. Some are from undenominational "faith" missions. Others are from non-co-operating denominational bodies. The largest of the latter are the Southern Baptists, and the Missouri Lutherans and the Seventh-Day Adventists are very widely represented. The non-co-operating missionaries are in the large majority in Latin America, parts of Africa, and Taiwan; they are a very substantial proportion of the Protestant missionaries in Japan, Thailand, and some other countries. Since their expansion is largely new, in many areas they are associated with only a minority of the "younger church" membership. It may well be that, a generation hence, the Protestantism of the "younger churches" will be more and more of that complexion.

Whatever the future, the five decades which have followed the World Missionary Conference of 1910 have witnessed a phenomenal growth of Protestantism throughout much of the world, with increasing co-operation, union, and mounting rootage outside the traditional strongholds of Protestantism in the Continent of Europe, the British Isles, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The current project for co-operation in theological education bids fair greatly to improve the quality of the indigenous clergy. More and more Christianity is ceasing to be Occidental and is becoming world-wide, firmly planted in every nation, race, and people. As always, it remains a minority movement, but the minority is growing and is ceasing to be regional or sectional.

4. The Call to Unity in Our Time

THEODORE O. WEDEL

HAS THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT become as yet a concern of the average churchman in America today? Grave doubt is clearly justified. The word "ecumenical" itself, with its five Greek-sounding syllables, is still a comparative novelty in the vocabulary of the man in the pew. He is no longer ignorant, we may assume, of the fact that something is stirring in the Christian world looking toward the reunion of the churches, or at least toward some forms of co-operation. But on the local level, he is tempted to leave the cause in the hands of his minister or of the denominational hierarchy at headquarters. The headquarters staff, in its turn, is tempted to ease its ecumenical conscience by voting into the denominational budget travel expenses for a small coterie of ecumenical specialists—at times called ecumeniacs—who are graciously permitted to sacrifice their holiday leisure to attend World Council of Churches meetings in Geneva or Denmark, or even in as far distant a vacation paradise as the Greek island of Rhodes.

I am, I confess, painting the scene in dark colors. Much could be said by way of optimistic appraisal. The fact that the ecumenical movement, as yet scarcely fifty years old, exists at all is a miracle of Providence. We are only three hundred years removed from the religious wars of the seventeenth century—wars which seemed to blaspheme even the last vestiges of Christian brotherhood. The cause of Christian unity has come a long way, and gratitude should be our primary mood. Nevertheless, a full acceptance of Christian brotherhood across lines of institutional separation is still far from accomplishment.

I

On the American scene two handicaps in particular burden the ecumenical cause. I suggest as names for these handicaps indifference and impatience.

THEODORE O. WEDEL, M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D., is Warden of the College of Preachers and Canon at Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C.; author of *The Coming Great Church*, *The Pulpit Rediscovered Theology*, etc. The present article is based on his address at a Convocation at Northwestern University in honor of the Ecumenical Institute at Evanston, Illinois, on May 8, 1959.

To deal first with the second of these handicaps—impatience. Insofar as the average Protestant churchman in America takes an interest in the call to church unity at all, he cannot easily understand why it should not come tomorrow. As he moves about from city to city or region to region, he changes his denominational allegiance with comparative ease. One Protestant church tradition, as it incarnates itself in a parish on the local scene at least, is much like another, with memories of the reasons for its differing from a neighboring tradition rarely mentioned even from the pulpit. Even the Episcopal and the Lutheran churches, though they set up more clearly marked and even exclusive entrance requirements, profit from many transfers of allegiance. Why the delay, then, in the emergence of at least a federated union, with mutual recognition of ministry and sacraments and membership rights all round?

It comes as something of a shock to many an observer that even if American Protestantism should achieve some sort of unification, this would ease the burden of ecumenical building of bridges across chasms of separation among Christians by only a fraction. The Oxford Dictionary definition of the word "ecumenical" is itself instructive—"of or representing," so it reads, "the whole Christian world or universal church." Such an embrace includes the Protestant State churches of northern Europe, frequently quite distinct in form from their namesake denominations in the United States. It includes the Eastern Orthodox communions of Greece and Russia and neighboring lands, with colonies now in America also. It includes forty million Anglicans around the globe who stubbornly cling to their church polity of Catholic descent with its insistence for ministerial recognition on the historic episcopate. It includes, if the definition means what it says, the majestic globe-encircling Church of Rome.

Participation in the ecumenical movement involves a church or denomination in an encounter, often embarrassing, with this entire spectrum or range of traditions, all bearing the name Christian, but separated by centuries of alienation and even past wars of mutual extermination. Church unity is, of course, the movement's ultimate goal. But it is under no illusions that deep chasms—that between East and West now a thousand years old—will be bridged overnight. Unity in basic faith and rediscovery of God's purpose for all of his people must come first. This will mean a painful submission to self-examination. Each separated communion is placed under the call to internal reform in the light of insights into the whole gospel of God's grace as this has been revealed to our brethren in Christ in other historic traditions. No "get-union-quick" schemes have

hope of success. Yet the wonder of the ecumenical movement is not thereby canceled out. That wonder and miracle of Providential guidance consists precisely in the fact that well-nigh two hundred separate churches now stand side by side listening to God's call to unity—a call which inevitably involves exposure to the judgments of God as well as the promise of grace. A gathering, long delayed, of the people of God throughout the world is slowly taking shape. It is as if we were again an assembly at the foot of Mount Sinai listening to God's call addressed to Moses: "Gather me this people that they may hear my word."

I turn now, however, to the other handicap which the ecumenical movement encounters on the American scene—indifference. Since our Protestant churches—omitting from view for the moment the Anglicans and Eastern Orthodox—have achieved amicable relations with one another, why not continue as we are? We are dedicated to the dogma of competition on the economic plane of our common life, fear of monopoly deeply anchored in the nation's conscience. Why, therefore, should competition, or at least diversity in church life, be bad for Christian witness? The emergence of a single monolithic Protestant Church, with a hierarchical pyramid of power analogous to the papacy and the Roman Vatican, would scare us to death.

Now, obviously, something can be said in favor of the church pluralism typical of the American scene. On our continent it was, it seems, an inevitable historic development. Immigrant groups—"the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues"—quite naturally established separatist assemblies and even denominations. How else could they preserve in an alien land, with its as yet often still alien language, the precious religious heritage of their fathers in the faith? But, surely, these pioneering years are now past history, language barriers have crumbled, and the mobility of population is making nonsense of once meaningful group isolations. Are we now in danger of separatist idolatries? Should not a call to unity now receive a hearing? As we read our unitedly revered Bible, that call is inescapable. Listening to it together in humility and penitence will itself release the uniting power of the Holy Spirit. Such listening produces astounding tokens of unity even between non-Romanist Christianity and the Church of the Papacy. More significant books wrestling with the problem of church unity, and even specifically with the ecumenical movement, it is said, are being written today by Roman Catholic theologians than by those in the Protestant camp. For we are discovering that a distinction can be drawn between the words *unity* and *union*.

A union of all the separated flocks of the people of God throughout the world in one visible Church may be a dream unrealized for centuries. But scores and even hundreds of manifestations of unity do not need to await the arrival of a fully reunited Christendom or solutions to the difficult problems of faith and order—unity in prayer, in the singing of one another's hymns, in service to the needy, in a word in witnessing to a gospel meant for the world outside church walls. The call to unity in our time is, surely, first of all, a call to Mission. Do we exist, even as churches, in behalf of ourselves? If not—if, instead, we are witnesses to a message of good news to all mankind—is there, possibly, a call to unity in fulfilling this mission prior to any other call? Nations, once enemies, frequently become friendly allies in a war against a newly revealed common foe. The ecumenical movement is revealing to the churches their common enemy and their desperate need of one another as allies in that warfare.

II

Listening to the call to a united mission to the world will, however, bring painful shocks to our complacent ease in Zion in our separatist households. Look, first of all, at the mission of the people of God in a local neighborhood. Such a neighborhood used to be called a parish—a "*paroikia*," a fellowship of men and women knowing one another precisely as neighbors. Such a neighborhood, in days before our era of competitive church pluralism, gathered itself in the parish church before a pulpit and an altar—with its neighborhood tensions, its gossip, its scandals, its mournings and its joys. God's judgments and words of forgiveness could be addressed to sinners in the raw, as it were, stripped naked of pretensions to self-righteous ease of conscience. If not fully aware of God's all-seeing eye, they were aware of the eyes of their neighbors.

Look by way of contrast, to a typical city or town in our land today. Except in a rare rural community, there are from six or seven to scores and even hundreds of churches among which residents in a neighborhood choose their places of worship. The Church of Rome still maintains parish boundaries and neighbors are still under discipline to worship in the local parish church, whether they enjoy neighborly contact or not. We, who are not under the rule of Rome, can escape such embarrassments. We gather ourselves, not in neighborhood parishes, but in congregations of like-minded men and women—those who are already our friends, who are usually of the same racial and cultural background, and who enjoy (mark the word) the same worship customs and forms, and the sermons of a compatible minister. The

invitation to the Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer is addressed to those who "are in love and charity with your neighbors." An honest rewriting, fitted to the actual scene in the pews, might read: "All ye who live at a sufficient distance from one another to be spared tensions with your neighbors, and temptations to uncharitableness and the humiliation of gossip revelations of your sins . . . draw near."

Bishop Newbigin of the Church of South India is for ever reminding us of the older Christendom that we shall not take the call to unity seriously until we face up to the astounding deflections of our *laissez-faire* church pluralism from the New Testament idea of what "church" *should* mean—God's choice of who are our fellow members in the One Body of Christ, worshiping where he has placed us as neighbors of one another. That is why an almost despairing cry for church unity comes to us of the older Christian world from the mission fields of Asia and Africa. We are not shocked, as we ought to be, by the appeal frequently voiced over the radio that every one next Sunday should worship in the church of his choice. What about God's choice rather than our own? In an Indian or African village there is no choice. The village is lucky if it has in its midst a church of any denominational description. A worshiper submits to God's choice of a sanctuary or to none.

We like our present ways and privileges, of course. A full revival of the very idea of parish churches rightly conceived awaits the solution of our disunity in the One Body of Christ. But even within a communion or denomination our ease in Zion ought to be disturbed. I limit myself to my own communion for illustration of what has somehow gone dead wrong. In the city of Washington, where I live, we Episcopalians gather ourselves in a score or more of congregations each composed of like-minded worshipers, each drawing its people from the same geographical region. These congregations vary one from another in liturgical traditions, in cultural tone, and, to be quite honest, in social or even snob appeal. We have, as it were, a layer cake of congregations, one piled on top of another, each competing with its rivals for worshipers from a regional circle miles and miles in circumference, not excluding distant suburbs. Place on top of this already sizeable Episcopalian layer cake, the similar one of the Methodist communion, and then that of the Baptists and Congregationalists and then on and on—the picture of the disunited people of God in Washington can be truly shocking. If our by now towering layer cake of superimposed congregations were cut into vertical segments or slices, all Christians within a neighborhood worshiping as a parish unit, and not scattered among scores of

separated sanctuaries of our own choosing, the very concept of what the word "church" once signified would leap into life. The comforts of racial segregation or those of social caste segregation would at one stroke be taken from us. Every slum area would be the mission field of the nearest Christian assembly.

Now I realize, of course, that I am picturing a return to a united Church of God impossible of realization in any near future. But my topic is the "Call" to unity for our time. The first result of a listening to that call may be precisely a realistic view of what our unhappy divisions have brought us by way of escape from obedience to our mission as the messengers of the gospel to all mankind. Gone will be our complacency and ease in our increasingly comfortable segregated sanctuaries. As we listen soberly to God's call to witnessing to his gospel, the distinction between Unity and Union mentioned earlier may prove useful. Church union in ultimate embodiment may have to await God's Providence, but does uniting in the mission of the people of God have to tarry? What about our slums, our juvenile delinquency, our glaring sins against the simplest forms of human brotherhood in our racial segregations? The call to unity becomes first of all a call to mission, and a call to church reform.

Even within a communion or denomination renewed obedience to the call to mission could be a uniting power. Look for a moment at the contrast today between the church in the inner city and the church in the suburbs. We point with pride to the hundreds of miniature cathedrals dotting the suburban and outer city landscape these days, with their luxurious parish houses, with their decorative organs and choirs, with pews and kneeling benches so comfortable that repeating the General Confession of our sins becomes as painless as reciting the multiplication table. But who, or what, is paying the price for all this ecclesiastical luxury? To a shocking extent, it is the inner city with its mouldering mansions, and its once tree-lined but now garbage-lined streets, from which suburbia has fled and which is now given over to decay. Many a suburban congregation is composed precisely of those who resigned a mission to neighbors God had given them in order to enjoy worship comforts with neighbors of their own choosing. Back we must go to inner city slums and housing desolations, by way of mission, if not renewed residence, to bring healing to the wounds in our corporate life which we have inflicted. And, clearly, this response to the mission of the people of God does not need to wait until we have solved all ecclesiological problems of faith and order.

Unity in mission and in the humbling servant-vocation of the people of

God—am I exaggerating its importance as the first step toward church union? I trust not. "Unity and Mission," or unity through obedience to the call to mission, is increasingly the theme song of the ecumenical movement. In the areas of the world being served by what we still define as "foreign missions," the need for unity in Christian witness, even of the simplest kind, is so obvious that its value scarcely requires the proof of argument. I limit myself instead to a sketch of this need in our supposedly still Christian homeland as well. I voice the conviction of an increasing number of observers that, if our eyes were fully opened to our vocation as Christians of whatever name, we would see stretching before us, even in America, and then circling the globe, a desert waste of need for brotherhood—a brotherhood possible only under the gospel of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

The very concept of unity in a human brotherhood under the care of a Father of all mankind, is, in a deeply meaningful sense, a monopoly of Christianity. The call to unity as between churches, therefore, is merely the echo, as it were, of a call to unity first of all between man and man, husband and wife, neighbor and neighbor, anywhere. Listen to this call to create unity and the magnitude of our task as the people of God can take our breath away. We encounter under God a call to mission undreamt of by our grandfathers.

III

The problem of creating unity between man and man is, indeed, far more difficult than our grandfathers had supposed. They were still living on the capital deposit of Christian grace implanted in Western culture during the centuries of the reign of Christendom. Man, at least Western man, was for them still Christian man, the horrors of Buchenwald and of the Communist purge and concentration camp impossible to imagine. We are slowly waking up to the grim fact that, when the restraints of religion are removed, we confront a problem of unity between man and man of gigantic proportions. Ours is not life in the Garden of Eden, but in a fallen world where Cain and Abel enact a universal drama of fratricide.

Contrast, even by way of passing glance, the literature and art of the romantic nineteenth century and that of our own. It is as if contemporary artists and dramatists were preaching one long sermon on the long neglected doctrine of original sin. Utopian dreams of human brotherhood are turned into a mockery in Picasso's *Guernica*, or in the novels of William Faulkner, or the plays of Tennessee Williams. Look at natural man when, in St. Paul's words, he is "without hope and without God in the world"—does he

by natural instinct love his fellow man? The existentialist realists of our day answer: "By no means." "My mind to me a kingdom is." Your mind is a kingdom in which your ego rules as a god in its turn. When we meet, is peace and brotherly love the obvious result? Is the result not rather war—a war which is normally hidden from view, we may grant, since we are afraid to take off our masks of civilized politeness, but which is still there? Man requires life in community. He is born into a family covenant. But even intimate natural brotherhood may be merely that of Cain and Abel.

Some of our wisest theologians today may be our atheist philosophers. Sentimental Christianity is today receiving a shock treatment on the philosopher-psychiatrist's couch. The shock treatment may, of course, kill as well as cure. But it may result in restorative healing. Look for a moment at the picture of human brotherhood without God as an honest atheist sees it. I turn to the contemporary French philosopher Sartre for concrete illustration. He describes a simple encounter between man and man. "Suddenly," so Sartre describes the experience, "an object has appeared which has stolen the world from me."¹ Or, as he outlines the problem of unity as natural man meets fellow-man, in the by-now-famous phrase in his play *No Exit*, "Hell is other people." Or, again, to cite a slightly longer summary of our human predicament as a Sartre sees it, when God has been relegated to the realm of dead illusions:

Man can do nothing unless he first understands he must count on no one but himself, that he is alone, abandoned on earth in the midst of his infinite responsibilities, without help, with no other aims than the ones he sets for himself, with no other destiny than the one he forges for himself on this earth. . . . Life is absurd, love is impossible. . . . There is no way of knowing the true meaning of what he is doing: perhaps our actions have no meaning.²

Now it is fairly obvious that atheism of the kind I have just portrayed is not as yet, perhaps, a great danger on the American scene. Even our "beat generation" scarcely has the courage to accept this burden of lonely Stoic defiance of Fate. Its place is taken by less demanding idolatries. The God of the faith of the high religions of the world is replaced by man himself—above all by social man. Is there not abroad in our world as principal rival to authentic Christianity a worship of man for man's sake, a religion precisely of human brotherhood?

With us in America, this religion of human brotherhood still draws sustenance from its Christian past. We cannot conceive of our worship of

¹ Sartre, J. P., *Being and Nothingness*, Philosophical Library, 1956, p. 255.

² *Harper's Magazine*, Sept., 1945.

Democracy or what we lovingly call our American Way of Life without the support of at least a remnant of Christian restraints and Christian grace. We are disturbed when we see it stripped of this verbally honored encumbrance as it marches across the globe under the banners of Communism. It may shock us to realize, however, that these two versions of faith in man in place of God are twin heresies. In either version, it is an appealing gospel. It offers love of man for man's sake, brotherhood, comradeship, loneliness healed in fellowship in a crowd, be it merely that of a theater audience or that of spectators at a ball game. In lands in which the gospel of brotherhood according to Karl Marx rules supreme, we see this religion in demonic form. The lonely individual seeks unity with his fellow man by surrendering his autonomy to a fellowship of shared hatred of any enemy. As with shipwrecked sailors on a raft on an open ocean, every man becomes savior to his neighbor. Worship of a god of some kind is, after all, ineradicable from the human heart, even if this god be a mortal man.

But a fearless look at even the most moving examples of the religion of human brotherhood without God will reveal, not a rediscovery of an innocent Paradise, but a repetitive drama of the Fall. Even the worshipers of Democracy as a gospel in its own right, or of our American Way of Life, should take warning. Man is not god, even when he is lifted to a pedestal of worship—no, not even social man. Many a story of a shipwrecked lifeboat has ended in mutual murder and even cannibalism. Our century's history has painted a canvas of shattered human brotherhood which should rob us permanently of the illusion of creating unity among men by human powers alone.

Have I wandered far from my topic, "The Call to Unity in Our Time"? If so, I here boldly confess that I have done so deliberately. Unity as between our now separated households in the Body of Christ will not loom clearly on our horizon unless we first find unity in our God-given mission to the world. This mission can begin at our church doors. It can begin within every gathering of the people of God of whatever name. Even in our divided state as separated households of God's chosen witnesses, we can become fellow workmen in the ministry of reconciliation. An able writer on the ecumenical importance for our time of the Liturgical Movement, which today is unifying the worship traditions of churches throughout the world, defines the future task of Christianity as that of recreating true social life of even the most rudimentary kind in our dehumanized world.³ Chris-

³ Hebert, A. G., *Liturgy and Society*, London: Faber & Faber, 1936, p. 193.

tianity has in its keeping the only power which can open the way for true unity between man and man. When it began its first march across the astonished empire of the Caesars, veritable miracles of unity marked its path: Jew and Gentile eating at the same table, master and slave equals in each other's eyes. Prepared for in the old covenant, these miracles of unity broke into flower, like a slow-blooming cirius, on the day of Pentecost and in the apostolic age. In the new fellowship of the Holy Spirit, men and women like ourselves discovered themselves members one of another, "for-bearing one another in love." Our world hungers for this miracle of unity—Cain reconciled with Abel, husband with wife, black man and yellow man with white man, factory hand with manager, neighbor with neighbor.

And if this call to unity finds obedient response first within our separated households of faith and is then obeyed as each household opens its doors and sends witnesses to the gospel of unity out into the crossroads of our common life, surely the day will come when unity in mission will result in a union of the separated households themselves. The reunion of churches will not emerge merely from summit conferences of ecumenical experts, indispensable though these are. It will come when the call to unity is seen first of all as a call to mission. He who issues this call is still one God. His call is one call. And the gospel of reconciliation between man and God and man and man is still one gospel. American Christianity is frequently contrasted with the church life of our European brethren as a Christianity of activism which neglects weightier concerns of faith and doctrine. We need a humbling of our pride, no doubt, and the discipline of the theological schoolroom. Yet if our activism can become true obedience to the call to mission, and not a substitute for it, we may yet be instruments in the hand of God to save the ecumenical movement from a burial in an academic coffin. The unity of the disunited Body of Christ may yet appear as a miracle of Providence when we find ourselves, like the marines on Iwo Jima, risking our lives together in raising the symbol of the Cross of Christ on a battlefield.

5. *The Contribution of Eastern Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement*

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS

WITH A DEEP SENSE of humility I wish to begin by thanking Almighty God who in His infinite mercy permitted me to serve Him in the field of interchurch relations as representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Geneva. Secondly, I would like to thank all of you who directly or indirectly made my task easier by virtue of the assistance that you rendered in the true Christian spirit with sincerity, understanding and love.

During the four years that I spent at the headquarters of the World Council of Churches I became acquainted with the major Protestant denominations and their leaders. During this period I was also able to gain a clearer understanding of the existing possibilities for closer contact and co-operation between the Orthodox and the Protestants in meeting the common responsibility that we have as Christians to God and the world.

This evening, as I speak to you in my entirely new capacity, I again glorify the name of the Lord, for He has led me toward new horizons which require ecumenical orientation and vision. I thank the Lord also for the additional opportunities granted me to participate in ecumenical affairs and thus renew my relationship with you in the same spirit of Christian love and fellowship which made our previous contacts so rewarding.

I was requested to speak to you this evening about the contribution of Orthodoxy to the ecumenical movement. Whoever suggested that this topic should be assigned to me is not my friend, since I am placed in the difficult position of analyzing a subject that no Orthodox can handle with absolute objectivity. However, since I accepted the assignment to speak on this topic, the originator of the title may relax, for the responsibility is now mine alone. I shall make every effort, therefore, to be as positive and as accurate and as objective as possible. I have chosen to separate my topic into two parts: (1) Why does the Orthodox Church participate in the ec-

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS is Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America. His address here published was presented to the annual meeting of the United States Conference for the World Council of Churches at Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania, on April 22, 1959. In August, 1959, at Rhodes he was elected a President of the World Council of Churches.

menical movement? and (2) how has Orthodoxy contributed in the past and how does it contribute at present in order to assist and further the ecumenical movement?

I

As an introduction to my subject I shall quote from the opinions offered by recognized members of the ecumenical movement who have expressed their views concerning Orthodoxy.

It would take volumes to explain what Orthodoxy is or stands for. But what is it in the eyes or in the judgment of a contemporary ecumenist? The ecumenical importance of Orthodoxy was expressed in *The Kingship of Christ*, by the late Dr. G. K. A. Bell, the honorary president of the World Council of Churches, when he wrote, "The full participation of the Orthodox Churches is a matter of great moment to the World Council of Churches."¹ This was expressed more positively by Dr. Visser 't Hooft before the Provisional Committee (in the United States in 1947) when he said that "The Eastern Churches have maintained a sense of the objective reality and the cosmic dimensions of the drama of salvation which the Western Churches need to recapture."² This is one aspect of Orthodoxy viewed from an ecumenical angle. But Orthodoxy is a little more than that! The Orthodox Church, according to Professor Henri Grégoire,

has been a living force, a moral force of the first order. And to do it justice one cannot rest content to describe it merely in its present attitude or in one only of the attitudes which it has successively assumed. Nothing can be more superficial than the reproach of 'Caesaropapism' with which it has at times been branded; nothing more inexact so far as the Byzantine Church is concerned than the charge of 'ceremonialism,' of formalism 'stifling the life of mysticism,' for this mystic life never ceased to inspire the ascetes and [at certain periods] even took possession of the masses."³

While Henri Grégoire tries hard not to be unjust to the Orthodox Church another writer, the Protestant author Robert Payne, in his recent book, *The Holy Fire*, notes more positively that "what is most astonishing in the Eastern Church is this gentle visionary quality allied with a conception of God as the *mysterium tremendum*, the starlit flood of powers sweeping across the heavens . . . In these fine-spun imaginations, lit with the Orient sun, Christ is seen more clearly and more sharply than in the West."⁴

We have quoted so far what non-Orthodox religious leaders and authors have said about Orthodoxy. Our own concept of Orthodoxy is that

¹ Penguin Books, 1954, p. 57.

² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

³ Baynes, N. H., and Moss, H., ed., *Byzantium*, Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1948, pp. 86-87.

⁴ Harper & Brothers, 1957, pp. xv, xvi.

it represents the Christian Church doctrine, order, worship, and tradition of the first eight centuries of united Christendom. The common use of the term "Orthodox" to signify the Church of the East should signify to the churches of the West that the Eastern Church is committed to maintain the genuine characteristics of the one Church of Christ.

Orthodoxy, being true to her history and traditions and compelled by the consciousness of her God-ordained task, is present and intends to be present and participate actively in all ecumenical conversations as long as their aim is to restore the disrupted unity of Christendom. Orthodoxy's principal aim in participating in the ecumenical movement is to make her own contribution to the sacred cause of bringing divided Christians together, and also to make known and impart to member churches of the World Council "the riches of her faith, worship, and order, and of her spiritual and ascetic life and experience" (Patriarchal Encyclical of February 6, 1952). The principle of Orthodox collaboration with the ecumenists of our century was set forth by the Patriarchal Encyclical of 1902. In this history-making Encyclical letter, the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III stated that, although

our primary task is to watch over our own doctrines, we must nevertheless be also concerned for our Christian brothers and never cease our prayers for the union of all into ONE. Difficulties should not discourage us, nor should the thought of the apparent impossibility of it (church unity) stop us from engaging ourselves in the work of church unity which is dear to God or from examining existing possibilities for it; we should always remember that it is our duty to walk in wisdom, and to conduct ourselves in meekness towards our separated brothers, for they also believe in the all-Holy Trinity and take pride in being called with the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, hoping also to be saved by the grace of God.

The Encyclicals that were issued in 1920 and 1952 did nothing else but reaffirm this principle which forms the foundation of the ecumenical theory and practice adopted by the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate.

The Orthodox Church therefore takes part in all discussions and deliberations on church unity, because she feels it is in line with her task to inform others how she stands on this very important issue. To use the words pronounced by the Orthodox in Edinburgh (1937), "The Orthodox Church discusses 'church unity,' for she believes that despite all existing difference of opinion and belief the Master and Lord is ONE—Jesus Christ, who will lead us to a more and more close co-operation for the edifying of the Body of Christ." This statement, inspired by and based on the well-known passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians (4:15-16), most accurately expresses the Orthodox mind. Orthodoxy opposes and will always oppose suggestions to the effect that we can entertain the idea of reunion on a

minimum basis or confine it to a few common points of verbal statements. The Orthodox Church will continue to discuss unity, but only in the hope and prayer that it may some day be commonly understood that "where the totality of faith is absent, there can be no *communio in sacris*," and conversely, that unity in the totality of the faith is unity indeed, carrying with it communion in every necessary ecclesiastical activity.

In the light of what we have so far said, it is obvious that the ecumenical movement creates no problems whatsoever for Orthodoxy. On the contrary, it creates a new atmosphere, favoring so far the hope for a fresh approach and study of the problem of "church unity." The Orthodox Church has never adopted a defeatist attitude. It is not in her nature. Difficulties, obstacles, disillusion, and even failures, often the case in the past, are not paralyzing but strengthening the belief that church reunion is still within reach. Differences in faith and order, in worship and tradition, constitute a challenge for Orthodoxy, not a reason for abstaining from ecumenical discussions.

It may be a mere repetition, but the truth must be repeated and re-emphasized when forgotten or overlooked. And the truth that should always be remembered in all ecumenical circles is that there are no churches but ONE, and that this truth is more than attested by church history. The branch theory, that is, that the true Church consists of the Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Anglican Churches, as well as the fragmentation theory, that is, that there is schism within the Church, or that all existing churches are to a greater or less degree "in schism," can find no ground of justification in church history. Orthodoxy, however, can perfectly see and comprehend present church realities. She knows all she needs to know in regard to the existing numerous communions, confessions, denominations, groups, and sects.

II

In general the Orthodox contribution to the ecumenical movement could be summarized with the following statement made by Nicolas Zernov some years ago:

The variety of reasons which bring Eastern Christians within the fold of the ecumenical movement explains the rifts and tensions which were manifested at most of the ecumenical gatherings. Yet in spite of these drawbacks, the role of the Orthodox in the development of the ecumenical movement was considerable and at times even decisive. The Orthodox were able to strengthen the desire of this new movement to find a firm foundation in sound doctrine, and they presented a view which could often reconcile the extreme wings of the Western interpretations of Christianity. They were also able to help towards satisfactory conclusions of theological debates by ap-

proaching controversial points from an angle unfamiliar to the Western spokesmen and yet consonant with the great traditions of the Church. Their presence made the ecumenical movement genuinely catholic in its scope and spirit and helped to guard against the danger of its becoming a merely pan-Protestant organization. Their chief contribution, however, was in those spheres of Christian life and worship where the Protestant West had been in the past particularly suspicious of the East; for example, in the emphasis on the Eucharist, and on veneration of the saints, and in insistence on the necessity of recognizing the significance of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the work of reconciliation. The creation of special sub-committees on the question of the veneration of the saints at Edinburgh in 1937, and support for the inclusion of the Eucharist in the program of the conferences, were valuable gifts brought by the Orthodox into this movement of reintegration. The very opposition which they provoked and are still provoking is an indication that they have something to give which may supplement the life of the Protestant communities at the very points where they are weakest.⁵

Consistent with the foregoing, Orthodoxy has offered herself wholeheartedly to the ecumenical movement. First, her teachings and beliefs to the Faith and Order Conference; second, her general and particular moral and social concepts to the Committee on Life and Work; third, her worship, with emphasis on the very special role and meaning of worship in the lives of the Orthodox Christians. Fourth, the true image of the Christian spirit permeating the Church which is usually witnessed by martyrdom. Fifth, the deeply religious, mystical and ascetic concepts of Christian experience which are discernible in the lives of her faithful as individuals and members of the family. Sixth, the sincerity with which all pronouncements are made; whether they be intended to convey the Church's reservations or complaints or her official views on ecumenical matters. Finally, I refer to the Orthodox contribution of the doctrine of unity in the Church as it is understood theologically and historically. In this last reference I wish to stress that through the centuries as well as in recent years the Orthodox Church has demonstrated not only a favorable inclination toward unity but also an affirmative ecumenical viewpoint that surpasses the testimony of any other Church to date.

In the limited time allotted to one lecture it is not possible to cite details of the Orthodox contribution to the endeavors of the Committees on "Faith and Order" and "Life and Work." Actually the specific information on this phase of our participation is given in *The History of the Ecumenical Movement*. I shall refer, therefore, only to a few points that have not been brought sufficiently to the attention of those who are concerned by ideology and personal conviction with the ecumenical activity of our century.

⁵ Rouse, R. & Neill, S. C., ed., *The History of the Ecumenical Movement*, London: S.P.C.K., 1954, p. 673.

III

All of us believe that the ecumenical movement must be brought down from the level of the ecumenists to the level of the people. From the complex terminology used by theologians to the language understood by the faithful. From the pulpit to the pew of the believer. From the pages of ecumenical literature to the lips of the readers. Before our movement can become truly ecumenical it must not only be presented objectively but understood subjectively. In order to achieve this, however, we must make every effort to bring together the faithful of our member churches so that they may really know each other.

I do not intend to dwell at length upon all the reasons which make imperative the closer contact and fellowship that should be promoted among our faithful. I am quite confident, however, that with such a policy it would be possible within a reasonable length of time to do away with whatever it is that holds us apart and, not infrequently, keeps us at odds. Once and for all we should dispel the notions still common among extreme non-Orthodox Christians that we Orthodox are superstitious, pagan-like worshippers dwelling in ignorance. At the same time we should help Orthodox zealots to understand that all the non-Orthodox are not dwelling either in darkness or in heresy or apart from Christ.

This closer contact of which I speak would perhaps assist the missionaries in the field so that they could better understand the proper direction in which they should channel more effectively their missionary activity. The Orthodox Church has frequently brought to the attention of our non-Orthodox friends the need for friendly contacts with her members. The Church has also recommended to her faithful on many occasions that they should consider it a personal responsibility to become better acquainted with their non-Orthodox brethren and thus learn the meaning and history of their religious heritage.

In this instance, therefore, I wish to state that the Orthodox Church has contributed to the ecumenical movement a spirit of mutual acquaintance and respect which is most essential, if the ecumenical spirit is to spread and become a part of the conscience of our faithful.

We Orthodox have opened the doors of our churches to all other Christians. We have also opened our eyes, our hearts and our minds. We are eager to explain whatever is considered superstition. Not only the veneration of icons but also the deeper significance which is implied by the honor rendered to them. We are anxious to explain our Seven Sacraments,

their biblical and theological basis, their actual role in our redemption. We are most willing to give any explanation requested about our Divine Liturgy and its symbolism; to clarify any part of doctrine expressed in the ritual or in the sacramental theology of the Liturgy; and to convey the effect of its spirituality and mysticism on the inner life of the faithful.

We are quite prepared to explain why we have icons and a perpetual vigil light in our homes, why we regard the family collected together as "a church in the house," why we observe periods of abstinence, why most of our people receive Holy Communion four times a year, why we especially honor the mother of our Lord, and why we offer memorial services for the departed.

We are never reluctant to explain why we have separate prayers for infants on the eighth and fortieth day after their birth; why we prefer to give Christian names to our children; why we use incense, boiled wheat, and holy water; why we distribute small pieces of bread after Holy Communion and at the end of the Service; why we wear special or ornate vestments during the Divine Liturgy and our other services; why we dress as we do; or why some of us have beards and long hair; and why we keep the Holy Bible on the family altar and read it by the light of the vigil lamp.

We are equally eager to learn why our non-Orthodox friends worship as they do, and we are prepared to recognize the reasons given for their basic religious, ritualistic, theological or ecclesiological position. I personally believe that the time has come for us to approach each other with humility and respect, on the basis that we have much to learn from such an experience, if we sincerely desire the ecumenical movement to become truly ecumenical.

IV

In brief, that which the Orthodox Church has brought into the ecumenical movement to date, and has been favored with the serious attention of sincere ecumenists, is basically her understanding of the One Church, her understanding of tradition, and her understanding of the ecumenical movement itself.

The Orthodox view of unity is well known and does not need detailed explanation. The Eastern Churches adhere to the belief that the real UNITY of the Church was never and can never be broken, since she is "the body of Christ, the fullness of Him" (Eph. 1:22-23).

What, therefore, the Orthodox means when speaking of unity is not unity in the strict sense of the word, but rather "union" or "reunion." This has been stated by Orthodox theologians more than once at the ecumenical

conferences, beginning with the Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne (1927), and ending with that held in Oberlin (1957). In the first the Orthodox delegates jointly stated that "reunion can take place only on the basis of the common faith and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries." In the last, the North American Faith and Order Study Conference, the particular statement read by Orthodox representatives was as follows:

The Orthodox Church teaches that the unity of the Church has not been lost, because she is the Body of Christ, and, as such, can never be divided . . . We admit, of course, that the unity of Christendom has been disrupted, that the unity of Faith and the integrity of Order have been sorely broken, but we do not admit that the unity of the Church, and precisely of the "visible" and historical church, has ever been broken or lost, so as to be now a problem of search and discovery. The problem of unity is for us, therefore, the problem of the return to the fullness of Faith and Order, in full faithfulness to the message of Scripture and Tradition and in the obedience to the will of God "that all be one."

The above quotations are sufficient to indicate beyond any doubt what the Orthodox view of "unity" is, and why, believing this, the Orthodox consider that the greatest service they can render to their Christian brethren at ecumenical conferences is to make their own position unmistakably clear by publishing separately their statement on the subjects under discussion.

In the question of sacred tradition the Orthodox Church again contributed a clear and concise statement of her understanding and teaching. For us, tradition does not come under the heading of Church History. Tradition is a stream which flows through the Church from the very beginning. We Orthodox hold that in its essence tradition cannot be understood in any way other than as the work of the Holy Spirit which guides the church unto the fullness of truth. Tradition, therefore, is the very life of the Church, and all Christians would do well to examine the subject of tradition in the light of the Orthodox viewpoint.

The interpretation that some Christians give to the word "tradition" is quite erroneous. Moreover, many of us make another unintentional mistake: we use the term "tradition" interchangeably with the term "traditions" and thus increase the existing confusion, since one never knows what we really intend to express with each of these two terms. I will not dwell on the theology of tradition itself, because I am afraid that we may find ourselves confronted with real and astounding conclusions.

I would recommend, therefore, a new historical and theological approach to the subject of tradition, if we wish to strengthen the ecumenical movement and not hinder its progress. Actually we do the latter when we

speak in our ecumenical conferences about our own particular traditions which are not only different one from another but at times in conflicting opposition. Certainly the time has come for us to initiate a new ecumenical tradition in order that we may bear witness one day to the attainment of ecumenical unity through the ecumenical movement.

The final contribution to the ecumenical movement by the Orthodox Church is her particular understanding of the term "ecumenical movement." Although we can readily find the reference in many other texts, I wish to call your attention to the Encyclical letter that the present Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras addressed to the other jurisdictions of the Orthodox Church on February 6, 1952:

According to its own constitution, the World Council of Churches seeks only to facilitate common action by the churches, to promote cooperation in study in a Christian spirit, to strengthen ecumenical mindedness among members of all churches, to support an even wider spreading of the Holy Gospel, and finally to preserve, uplift and generally restore spiritual values for mankind within the framework of common Christian standards. We can, therefore, unreservedly say that the principal aim of the World Council is essentially practical, and that its main task is one which is sanctioned by God. All in all, the World Council of Churches, as the outward expression of an inner noble wish that embraces the soul of Christendom, is an organization worthy of our full attention.

We of the Orthodox Church must participate in this pan-Christian movement because it is our duty to impart to our heterodox brethren the riches of our faith, worship, and order, and of our spiritual and ascetic experience. On the other hand we must inform ourselves of their new methods and their conceptions of church life and activity, things of great value, that the Orthodox Church could not appropriate or foster in the past on account of the particular conditions in which she lived. We believe therefore that the participation and cooperation of the Orthodox Church with the World Council of Churches in the future is both necessary and valuable.⁶

To the above we are now able to add the latest pronouncement of His All-Holiness in reference to the announcement by the Vatican of the proposed Ecumenical Council. The Patriarch has said, "No synod can be called ecumenical unless it is truly such, that is, pan-Christian." His All-Holiness has further defined that: "If the Orthodox Church is invited, it will be represented only if the entire Christian world is invited to send representatives. The minimum representation of the other Churches would be their collective representation through the World Council of Churches."

With this definition which coincides with the historical testimony of the ecumenical spirit of Orthodoxy, His Holiness delineates his faith in the ecumenical movement. For this reason the Spiritual Leader of Orthodox Christianity has always urged the various jurisdictions of our Church to

⁶ *Ecumenical Review*, January 1953, pp. 167-169.

designate full and adequate representations. His Holiness truly wants to see adequate support given to the ecumenical movement. In an official statement issued two years ago on the occasion of the World Council of Churches' Central Committee meeting in New Haven, he stated that since the Orthodox Church believes in the ecumenical movement, it would not wish to see any weakening of its force. For this very same reason the Ecumenical Patriarchate is in favor of any means or measures that could give additional strength to the ecumenical movement. Furthermore, it has stated its position against anything which could eventually result in diminishing the prestige of the *World Council of Churches*.

The Orthodox Church's understanding of the ecumenical movement is, in my humble opinion, another contribution, however small, to the true universal character of the ecumenical movement.

I would like to emphasize that the Ecumenical Patriarchate is watching with profound interest the development of the ecumenical movement and wants to see it become strong enough to embrace all Christian Churches throughout the world.

Of course we know the present trend of the movement and we are very pleased with its determination to move ahead. Recent mergers of different yet related confessions and churches here in America are furthering the hope for a gradual narrowing of the gap between the various traditional streams.

We are fully aware of the existing difficulties, but we most earnestly adhere to the solemn obligation to pray that our faith may be so strengthened as to remove all such difficulties. It is in this hope and prayer and in this deep conviction that the Orthodox Church participates in the ecumenical movement. Our Lord Jesus is still praying for us. May His will be done. "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us . . . and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." (Eph. 2:14, 17-18.)

6. *The World Council and the Creedless Church*

HOWARD H. BRINTON

CAN A CREEDLESS CHURCH in all sincerity and good conscience join the World Council of Churches? This question is faced by the Society of Friends in America and by some other member churches which either have no creed as a test of membership or which, having made creedal declarations, do not require their members' assent to them. The so-called "Basis of Membership" in the World Council, though not a complete creed, is clearly a creedal statement. The first article in the Constitution of the World Council declares that it is "a fellowship of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior."

I

It was with a good deal of hesitation that the Society of Friends accepted the invitation to join the World Council of Churches. This hesitation was occasioned partly by the creedal statement and partly by a vague fear of too much contact with "ecclesiasticism." But the apprehension that a decentralized group such as the Quakers, composed of laymen, would find it difficult to co-operate with trained clergy has not, on the whole, been justified. The Quakers have had little difficulty in securing recognition of their views as constituent elements in the total pattern of Christian faith and practice, even though these views were often contrary to deeply felt con-

HOWARD HAINES BRINTON, Ph.D., was for many years Director of Pendle Hill, a Friends Center for Religious and Social Studies, Wallingford, Pennsylvania. As a delegate from the Society of Friends he attended the World Council conferences at Amsterdam and Lund, and is currently Chairman of the Church Unity Committee of the Friends General Conference.

The term "Society of Friends" in this article refers only to that section of the Society in America called the "Friends General Conference" which, along with some other groups, retains the unprogrammed meeting for worship based upon silent waiting upon God. During this silent waiting the responsibility for vocal ministry, if there be any, rests on any members of the congregation, man or woman, who may feel called upon by the Divine Spirit to speak. This way of worship characterized all Friends for more than two centuries. During the past eighty years, however, this method was given up by a number of meetings, often referred to as the "Friends Church," which adopted a mode of worship presided over by a pastor. The largest section of this group, the Five Years Meeting, joined the World Council without reservations. It adopted in 1922 an authorized statement of faith, but largely retains the Quaker form of church government.

victions of the great majority of members of the World Council. The Society of Friends has felt that its membership in the World Council has been worthwhile because of the opportunity, so liberally offered, for the expression of its position. But the acceptance of the verbal formula or any other verbal formula as a basis of membership remains like a boulder on the road to genuine Christian unity. Friends seek for what the epistle to the Ephesians calls "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Christian history has demonstrated many times that an attempt at unity based on the acceptance of a form of words has been divisive.

Membership was accepted by Friends on the assurance by officials of the Council that the Council was not concerned with the interpretation of the Basis of Membership. The Society of Friends includes members representing a wide variety of theological opinions, from extreme liberal to extreme evangelical, and is not in a position to accept any one interpretation.

That a similar variety of opinion exists in other member churches of the World Council, including churches which have adopted creeds, is evident in contemporary religious periodicals and theological treatises. The historic creeds of Christendom have all been the result of compromises, never of unanimity. In modern Christendom as a whole we find an attitude of reverent independence toward the historic verbal symbols of the Christian faith. This is especially true of statements regarding the nature and work of Christ, which are often paradoxical and where the same words can be used to designate quite different conceptions.

It may be that any discussion of the Basis is now out of date and unimportant, for little recognition has been given to it at ecumenical gatherings. The reports and speeches on these occasions have been decidedly Christ-centered, and Christ is frequently and properly mentioned as the Divine Head of the Church in whom and through whom the church attains whatever unity it has. But he is seldom, if ever, called God except when specific reference to the Basis is made. He is referred to as Lord, or Christ, or "Lord and Savior," titles which are used in the New Testament. It is to be expected that speakers and writers well saturated with New Testament ideas should use New Testament terms. The title "God" for Christ has little New Testament basis except in very doubtful translations of Titus 2:13 and Romans 9:5, and a possible interpretation of the Logos Christology of John which is more congenial to Quakerism than to sects with a more definitely Trinitarian doctrine.

But the Society of Friends is in a peculiar position in regard to creeds and all other outward forms. It began as an unusual and particularly

stubborn attempt, carried further than in any sect of Protestantism, to stand against what George Fox called "form without power" or "shadow without substance." Any routine form or symbol prescribed in advance, such as a prepared sermon, a sacramental ritual, the recitation of a creed or the singing of a hymn was held to be inappropriate in public worship as "form without power," if it lacked the fresh and immediate anointing and guidance of the Spirit by which it could become a sincere and genuine spiritual exercise. Friends are accordingly careful that any statement of belief should arise from the individual's direct apprehension of the truth rather than as an expression imposed by church authority or tradition. The insights of the past are useful and necessary aids, but they are secondary to the immediate revelation of the Spirit which is primary. This Spirit of Truth will, as Jesus predicted, guide into all truth, but it cannot do so if "truth" becomes hardened and fossilized in a set, unchangeable dogma. In the Bible itself there is ample evidence of changing and deepening insights. One biblical scholar¹ has listed eight points of view in the New Testament.

This position of being constantly in search of truth did not prevent many Friends or groups of Friends from making statements regarding religious belief. Right belief has always been considered highly important. But no individual or group has undertaken to speak for the whole body or for the future as well as the present. Either the Divine Light, the Christ Within, the Way, the Truth and the Life, is not now present, in which case we must rely on evidence from the past; or is present, in which case we may not ignore its presence or try to predict what this presence will reveal.

It is not surprising that Friends have been accused of extreme individualism and even anarchism. Yet the history of the Society has abundantly shown that this accusation is not valid. Individualism and anarchism have been avoided in two ways, first through a belief that the Holy Spirit inspires the group as a whole and therefore the individual must check his own insight with that of his fellow members; second, because of the identification of the Divine Spirit Within with that Life, Light and Truth, to use the words of John's Gospel, which found supreme and complete revelation in Jesus of Nazareth. Therefore any religious insight must be checked by the teachings of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels. These teachings were not new laws to replace the old laws of Moses. They represented a new outpouring of the Spirit which introduced a new dispensation in which the "law," as Jeremiah predicted, would be written not on tablets of stone but

¹ Scott, Ernest F., *The Varieties of New Testament Religion*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943.

on the heart. Friends have professed to be followers not only of the historic Christ but also of the Christ Within. A meeting or congregation can become the Body of Christ only by permitting his Spirit to guide and inspire it as the human soul inspires and guides a human body. Obviously this is generally an ideal rather than a full accomplishment.

Friends have not been greatly concerned with a theological or philosophical theory of the relationship between the historic Christ and the Christ Within. They have been apprehensive of what they sometimes called a "notional religion" of ideas "afloat on the surface," rather than a religion based on deep inward experience. Religious life and religious thought are related but incommensurable. Quaker literature has been mainly biographical or autobiographical and therefore principally concerned with personal experience. Quaker preaching has been an appeal to follow the inward admonitions of the Spirit, or it may be the expression of a social concern arising out of the silence of the meeting. Quakerism inherited both the Hebrew prophetic tradition which led to speech and action and the Greek contemplative emphasis which led to silent inward search for the revelations of the Spirit.

In the seventeenth century when the Quaker movement began, Quakers were again and again accused by Puritan divines of not being Christians. More than 650 anti-Quaker books and pamphlets were published, based on this accusation, and each one was answered, usually by the citation of scriptural quotations. This self-defense required of the Quakers the development of a theology, though they never used this theology in addressing one another. The only systematic Quaker theological treatise, written by Robert Barclay and first published in Latin in 1676, was addressed to the clergy of the Protestant churches. Sometimes, in defending their position, the Quakers quoted the early sayings of the first Protestant Reformers. But both in England and New England by the middle of the seventeenth century, Protestantism had crystallized into a highly authoritarian form of religion which denied religious liberty and was allied with the state. After a long and painful struggle including severe persecution, in which many Friends lost all their property and some their lives, Friends gained legal toleration of their status as Christians. They feel that they have won by a hard way a place in the main stream of Christianity and that their principal contribution to it was their successful struggle for religious liberty. Of the five American colonies dominated politically at one time or another by the Quakers, the three in which they were strongest were the only ones which never had a state church—Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Delaware.

II

The desire to be accounted Christians, and to take a place along with other Christians in the World Council of Churches, has led Friends to seek for an interpretation of the Basis of Membership which they can accept. But it should be recognized that any interpretation is in reality superficial, because Christianity is based on a Life, and life defies definition. The Divine Presence in the midst of the worshiping congregation must be felt, not just thought about.

But thought should not and cannot be avoided, even though it is not all-important in religion. We are bound by our very nature as human beings to rationalize our feelings. A possible interpretation of the Basis may be derived from the Logos Christology of John on which Quaker theology, what little there is of it, has generally, though not always, been founded. To this can be added parts of the letters of Paul where Christ is called "the wisdom of God and the power of God" (I Cor. 1:24). The Logos of John is not the Reason of the Stoics, immanent throughout the universe as the source of order, but the dynamic creative Word (John 1:3) which "was with God and was God" (John 1:1), the life and light of men (John 1:4), "which enlightens every man" (John 1:9). This Light has always been in the world, shining into the darkness (John 1:5). At the climax of the creative process it shone with full brilliance in the person of Jesus Christ. Since the Word or Light "was with God and was God," Jesus may in this sense be truly called God. But he was just as truly man, and exhibited not only what God is, but what man may become. This fact, the fact of the Incarnation, which is central to Christian thought, is omitted by the Basis, which thus opens the way for a variety of Christian heresies maintaining that the humanity of Jesus was in reality only an appearance.

It appears therefore that the Society of Friends is in a better position to accept the Basis of the World Council than are some Christian groups which stress a more explicit Trinitarian doctrine. If the "Light Within" is also the "Christ Within" and also "that of God in every man," a term frequently used by Friends, then indeed Christ is God.

John's Gospel does not begin with the appearance of Christ in history but with the Word. In the same way Quaker theology begins with the Word, Light or Spirit by which alone any historical fact can be recognized as valid and significant. "The Light of Christ Within," says William Penn, "as God's gift for man's salvation is the root of the goodly tree of doctrines." The theology of the more authoritarian churches begins with Christ, who

as priest and king delegates his redeeming power to a church and his authority to a book. Such churches sometimes have difficulty in finding an important place for the Holy Spirit, which has been called "the step-child of Christian theology." An examination of the indices of several recent books on theology reveals many references to Christ but few to the Holy Spirit. But the Quaker interpretation of John and Paul, while not denying the great historical importance of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, places central emphasis on what concerns the present, that is, on the redeeming power of the Christ Spirit in man, "a spring of water welling up to eternal life."² Man is born to a higher life through the Spirit "which blows where it wills." Paul speaks of "Christ in you the hope of glory" and of "Christ who lives in me." Such expressions indicate that Christ's work was not finished on the cross. It continues in the heart of man. This is a matter of experience rather than of theory. It goes without saying that such a doctrine is no longer peculiar to Quakerism.

But there are many kinds of religious experience: some personal, the object of which is Christ or our Father in Heaven; some impersonal, the object of which is Truth, Life, Light, Love. These various experiences properly give rise to a variety of terms for God. One can find in Quaker literature at least fifty different words to indicate the Inward Light, but they are not identical in meaning. God reveals himself in many ways, not just in three. Sometimes the Inward Light in its redeeming power is spoken of as "the Blood of Christ"; as a germ of the Kingdom of Heaven it is spoken of as the Seed according to the parable, or the Leaven. As Light, it is the source of religious and moral knowledge. As Life or Power, it gives strength to act on this knowledge. As the one Vine of which we are all branches, it is the source of unity among men.

This simple and perhaps naive theology has left Quakers untroubled by such apparent paradoxes as "How can Christ be both divine and human?" and "How can man be saved only by the Grace (or Light) of God and yet be held responsible for his salvation?" We know by actual experience how the divine and human in ourselves can either co-operate as one single will or appear as two opposite wills. Our part in the redemptive process is not just an act of faith and trust in some wholly external transaction. It is an actual identification of our human will with God's will in which alone there is perfect freedom. "Any one who does not have the spirit of Christ, does not belong to him" (Rom. 8:9). If we think in terms of a definable sub-

² Biblical quotations are taken from the Revised Standard Version.

stance the paradox cannot be resolved, but if we rely on an indefinable will the paradox is resolved through experience.

In the seventeenth century Friends were accused of blasphemy because they claimed the same inspiration, though not the same degree of inspiration, as that which prompted the prophets and apostles of biblical times. Some "radical Puritans" agreed with them in this, but none agreed with them in believing that the Light of Christ "that enlightens every man" (John 1:9) was and had been in every man, good or evil, since the beginning of creation, even though the individual had never heard of Christ's gospel. This is the gospel "preached in³ every creature under heaven" (Col. 1:23). If any man, Christian or pagan, lived up to the measure of Light, however dim, which was vouchsafed him, he would be accepted by God. This made the "invisible Church" wider than Christianity. Friends could not believe that a God of love would condemn any man for unavoidable ignorance. Here again Friends are perhaps better able to accept the World Council's Basis of Membership than are some other groups. If Christ is God and God's power exists everywhere, then Christ's salvation is everywhere operative. "Christ died for all men," not just Christians. Christians need more doors through which to approach other religions, and this is perhaps one of them.

III

In spite of such universalism Friends are willing to acknowledge that Christians, and especially members of the World Council, need some Basis which can hold them together and distinguish them from non-Christians. This unifying and distinguishing belief has been mentioned very often in ecumenical assemblies. "Jesus is Lord," the first Christian creed, remains the greatest common divisor of the beliefs of all Christian groups. The Lordship of Jesus, whereby we acknowledge ourselves to be his disciples, regardless of our theory regarding his birth, nature and death, is or should be our bond as Christians. This is, in terms of actual living, a more important bond than any theory about his nature, important though that may be. As his followers we must endeavor so to live our lives as to be like him, a far more difficult undertaking than the acceptance of any doctrine. The word "Lord" as used in the New Testament originally meant "master," not God. Friends, while protesting against any verbal Basis, offered an amendment to the constitution of the World Council of Churches containing only the words Lord, Christ and Savior as titles for Jesus, but this was rejected.

³ The Greek word is *ἐν* meaning "in," and not "to" as translated.

The title "Lord" as applied to Christ in the New Testament makes more specific requirements of us than does the title "God." God is unfathomable, beyond our intellectual comprehension and imitation, but a Master makes clear-cut demands of his disciples. "Why do you call me Lord and not do what I tell you?" (Luke 6:46). Here we are confronted with the modern doctrine that Jesus preached a code of behavior beyond the attainment of sinful mortals, embedded in a sinful society. At the first assembly of the World Council in Amsterdam in 1948, those of us who were members of Section IV which dealt with international problems, and who were pacifists or inclined toward pacifism, found it surprisingly easy to introduce into the Report such declarations as "War is contrary to the will of God," "War as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ," "The church has always demanded freedom to obey God rather than men." To the Quakers this seemed to be absolute pacifism—and it took time for us to realize that non-pacifists could vote to support these words because they believed that Christ had put before men in his teaching an unattainable ideal, a perfectionism impossible of achievement in this imperfect world.

It is a strange paradox that the interpreters of Christianity who are the most Christocentric in their theology are unwilling to take seriously what Christ taught, or at least what the early church thought that he taught, when he said, "Be ye perfect." We are not limited to the choice between two evils, war or submission to tyranny, for Jesus chose neither. If Jesus is not only Lord but also Christ or Messiah, he came to introduce his Kingdom, the Kingdom in which the code of behavior which he preached and lived would prevail. Gentile Christianity had no room for the popular Jewish concept of a Messiah, but Gentile Christianity became a Church, a colony of heaven (Phil. 3:20), in which the Kingdom had already made a beginning. There was a mystical sense of the immanence of the Kingdom both on the part of those who expected it to come suddenly and those who had given up this hope. To some in 1660, who were expecting that the Second Coming would soon occur, George Fox declared that Christ had already come in the heart. If Christianity places the advent of God's Kingdom "beyond history" and holds it to be wholly unrelated to man's efforts to bring it about, it cannot compete successfully with those materialistic ideologies which promise an ideal social order in history. But whatever may be its prevailing type of theology, and there are several types, it cannot be said that the World Council with its many social concerns has ignored the social teachings of Jesus.

IV

The Quaker doctrine of the sacraments as inward and spiritual creates difficulties on the road toward unity, but so do other doctrines of these same sacraments. It is not surprising that disunity is more troublesome at this point than anywhere else, for actions are more definite than are the indefinite, ambiguous theological terms. The discourse at the Last Supper as recorded in John's Gospel was concerned more with unity than with any other subject, and the only sacrament reported as instituted there was the washing of feet. If the spirit of humility which this act teaches should prevail in Christendom much contention would be avoided. It is too easy for a Quaker to sit back and watch with an air of detachment the efforts of World Council members to arrive at a conclusion which will enable them to be together at "the table of the Lord." This to him is not an essential element in church unity. It is the genuine spirit of communion with God and man which is indispensable.

At Lausanne in 1927, during the first World Council on Faith and Order, the Quaker delegation stated its position on the visible sacraments. A long, stormy debate followed during which the Quakers were silent. How could these Quakers be accepted as Christians? Finally Charles Gore, Bishop of Oxford, rose and solemnly declared, "God is not limited by his own sacraments." A motion was then adopted which admitted as members of the Christian body those who "do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through the immediate contact with God through his Spirit."⁴ This liberal position was never retracted at later ecumenical gatherings.

I was astonished to hear, at the Faith and Order Conference at Lund in 1952, Leonard Hodgson, a leading theologian of the Church of England, say in the opening address: "At first sight Catholic sacramentalism and Quaker religion seem to be at opposite ends of the Christian world. Yet I have sometimes wondered if there may not be a place for both in a united Church." Dr. Hodgson was thinking of occasions when no one was present with authority to administer the sacraments. It should be recognized, however, that Quakerism is a sacramental religion, silent worship itself being sacramental. Rudolf Otto in *The Idea of the Holy* points out kinship between the Quaker meeting and the Roman Catholic Mass. "Both," he says, "are solemn religious observations of a numinous and sacramental character, both are communion, both exhibit alike an inner straining not only 'to realize the presence' of God but to attain to a degree of oneness

⁴ *Faith and Order*, 1927, p. 434.

with Him."⁵ Since the World Council recognizes as valid at least three forms of the Sacrament of Communion, it thereby recognizes the possibility of a variety of forms, including that of Quakerism.

The early church was led by prophets and apostles (I Cor. 12 and 14). But in the course of a single century the prophets as leaders were succeeded by the priests who became guardians of orthodoxy and administrators of the sacraments. In the Society of Friends the prophets were leaders for a longer period than in early Christianity, because the Quakers had no fixed creed to guard and no outward sacraments to be administered. In Quakerism today a growing intellectualism, due largely to the wider prevalence of higher education, has tended to eliminate the older type of prophetic ministry, but nevertheless there still remains the freedom of the Spirit to blow "where it wills."

Friends feel that in many respects Protestantism in general is closer to the Quaker position than it was in the seventeenth century. The increasing prominence of the laity, both men and women, is an example. We welcome the recognition of conscientious objection to participation in war as one of three recognized positions.⁶ And especially are we glad that the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, through its subcommittee appointed in 1950 on conscientious objection, promulgated to all nations an appeal that the rights of conscientious objectors to military service be protected.

V

Another important area in which unity has not been attained is the theory of the nature of the church. At Amsterdam, Section I in the report outlined two conceptions, the "Catholic" and the "Protestant," meaning by the latter that of the great Reformation confessions. A protest arose which secured the insertion of a clause mentioning a third type, "the gathered community and the idea of the free church." But the report went on to compare at length only the first two. It is natural that the more authoritarian churches, depending as they do on the specified human leadership of their clergy, should have furnished most of the leadership of the World Council. But the World Council itself is organized largely on the free church principle. The member churches exist within it as independent units. As long as this obtains, such "free churches" as the Society of Friends can consistently exist within it.

The Quaker can view the debate on the nature of the church with the

⁵ Oxford University Press, 1928, p. 218.

⁶ Report of Section IV of the Amsterdam Assembly.

same detachment as that with which he views the debate on the sacraments. He belongs to a religious society which makes no claim to be a church in any sense of that term, or to be composed of the converted and the redeemed. It can be joined by persons convinced of its principles, but this is regarded only as a first step. Conversion as a real change of life is considered a life-long process, including occasional success and occasional failure. The Religious Society of Friends is more like a family than a "church," for a member can be born into it. As a family, its members are interdependent economically, intellectually and spiritually. A Friends Meeting, while far from being always a "community gathered by the Spirit," can sometimes, especially during the hour of worship, become so gathered. Here perhaps we face a fourth type, neither Catholic, classical Protestant, nor typical Free Church.

The average Quaker is not willing to say, as a recent World Council document has declared,⁷ that disunity is a sin. We have not all been granted the same degree of insight into truth, and the result is disunity. The sin is not to live up to such insight as we have and to close our minds to further insight. There is room for us all in our Father's house, which as Jesus said "has many rooms" (John 14:2). Whitehead shows that in the history of science "a clash of doctrines is not a disaster—it is an opportunity."⁸ But scientists are more open-minded than are theologians. There has been ample evidence at ecumenical gatherings of an increase of understanding and good will, but little sign of change of opinion. In the ecumenical or universal household of faith there are now many windows, but as yet few doors. There has also been too much pointing upward into heaven or backward into history, and not enough pointing within.

The vast increase in the speed of travel and communication is bringing our modern world into an increased understanding of itself and many institutions are developing to implement this change. The World Council of Churches and the United Nations are two of the most important of these institutions. By a tradition which is three centuries old, the Quakers are peace-minded and internationally-minded. They welcome this progress toward unity and are willing to do their utmost toward its furtherance.

⁷ Third Assembly Document No. 1.

⁸ Whitehead, A. N., *Science and the Modern World*, The Macmillan Company, 1926, p. 266.

7. What Next?

STEPHEN NEILL

THE FIRST ANSWER to this question must be clothed in anything but exciting colors. It deals with "integration," one of those strange pieces of jargon that the movement tends to cast up in its progress, partly no doubt because so many of its leaders have to think in one language and speak in another. The modern ecumenical movement began in the sphere of missionary responsibility; then the two main streams began to diverge, and World Council and International Missionary Council have endured a period of not altogether easy coexistence. Naturally for many years past there has been a feeling that the two wings ought to get together again.

Various steps have been taken in this direction. Since 1939 the two bodies have had a joint committee. (Owing to wartime conditions, this did not actually meet till 1946.) Since Amsterdam 1948, each has existed officially in association with the other. The two co-operated in creating in 1946 one of the most effective of ecumenical bodies, the Churches' Commission on International Affairs. But when it comes to the question of "integration," in such a form that there is only one great international ecumenical organization and not two, we begin to come up against a host of complex problems.

There is, first, a purely technical problem. From the beginning the International Missionary Council has been a Council of Councils. Its members are the councils or conferences of missionary societies in the sending countries and the Christian councils in the various lands of the younger churches. Missionary societies are related in one way or another to churches, but they are not themselves churches. A body such as the National Christian Council of India includes representatives of churches, representatives of missions, and of corporations such as the Bible societies, which are strictly speaking neither missions nor churches. The World Council, as its official name implies, is a council of churches. Only church bodies which pass the

The Rt. Rev. STEPHEN NEILL is an Anglican bishop, known the world over as both author and leader in the ecumenical movement. He is Editor of the World Christian Book series, under a committee of the International Missionary Council: books especially for use in missionary lands. This article is taken from the closing chapter of his most recent book, *Brothers of the Faith*, copyright © 1960 by Abingdon Press.

Council's definition of what a church should be—a definition not entirely satisfactory to all churches—are eligible for membership. Certain other great international bodies such as the Y.M.C.A. and the Student Federation have a standing fraternal relationship to the World Council, but they cannot qualify for membership and can exercise no official influence on its policy. It is clear that any form of union between I.M.C. and W.C.C. is going to demand the exercise of a considerable amount of ingenuity.

The necessary ingenuity has been available. The Joint Committee of the two bodies has produced a plan which was felt to be workable and which secured a considerable measure of approval from members of the Central Committee of the World Council in 1957. Conveniently the I.M.C. was holding an Assembly in Ghana in January, 1958, and here "integration" was one of the main subjects for discussion. Some may have thought that with the preparations so carefully made and with such obvious advantages in union, the matter would go through almost without discussion. If so, they were to be severely disillusioned—in the ecumenical world things never go quite so easily as planners have hoped and expected.

The manner of presentation of the theme was, to say the least, unfortunate. The first three speakers were all Americans; all had been deeply engaged in the earlier planning, and all were strongly in favor of integration. It is not surprising that some delegates felt that this plan was being sold them, without any real freedom to say Yes or No. The immediate result of this introduction was that Max Warren rose, and spoke to the subject for a full half hour. This was in itself important. The Rev. Canon M.A.C. Warren, General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society in London, is recognized throughout the churches as one of the few quite first-rate thinkers on missionary problems in the whole Christian world. His monthly newsletters, each one devoted to a careful survey of some area of the world or some field of special Christian concern, are masterly, and contain some of the most up-to-date thinking on missionary affairs that is available anywhere. His speech was unusual. He started by saying that he was going to vote for integration but that he would do so with a heavy heart, because of the evils that he saw almost certainly following on the vote.

What were these evils? There was far more opposition to integration than had been foreseen. There was a widespread feeling in the missionary world that the World Council and its leaders were not really interested in the preaching of the gospel in the world, and that if the I.M.C. were absorbed by the already larger body, the missionary interest would simply be lost; it would then be necessary to create a new I.M.C. to take the place of

the body that had been killed by integration. Some felt that each organization was already, if anything, too large, and that amalgamation could produce only a completely unmanageable monster. But by far the most serious opposition came from those who would call themselves "evangelicals." We must distinguish sharply between this group and those responsible for the vitriolic and baseless attacks on the World Council and its leadership.

To make clear the nature of this opposition, the best method will be to use a rather long quotation from a letter written more than eighteen months after the Ghana Assembly, temperate in tone, and from the pen of a man who has friends in many camps:

The chief reason why the typical conservative evangelical is uninterested in the World Council of Churches is seldom theological. . . . The typical conservative evangelical is seldom a good denominational man. He is normally more concerned with getting on with his work for Christ in the district in which he lives than with synods, assemblies and central committees. He is normally very willing to stretch a hand across denominational barriers at the local level, whenever he thinks there is a practical value in so doing. . . .

Then you seem to overlook that there are prominent elements in the W.C.C. which do not really want to make the movement all-embracing. We have to face the fact that there are liberals who regard the conservative evangelical with horror, especially if he belongs to a "fringe" sect. . . . It is not sufficient to write of the "neglect" of this side of Christianity; if it had been only this, it could be healed without too much difficulty. We are dealing with an active hostility on the part of a small but influential section of W.C.C. leadership. . . . An interesting commentary on this is the way in which the International Missionary Council was able to build up a very much wider co-operation than the W.C.C. has achieved, at least among Protestants. The elements that are pressing most strongly for W.C.C.-I.M.C. integration are fully aware that it will lead to a breakdown in much of the missionary co-operation that now exists, but they seem to be indifferent to the fact so long as the bigger united body can be set up. It is doubtless unfair, but is it too unfair if I suggest that the motto of many in the Ecumenical Movement would seem to be not "That they may all be one," but "That all the more respectable of them may be one"?¹

It is always good to see ourselves as others see us. There is a great deal in these criticisms that needs to be taken seriously by the ecumenical leadership. It is unquestionably true that the I.M.C. has produced co-operation over a wider field than the W.C.C. It is unquestionable that much of that co-operation is threatened by the moves toward integration.

A large part of Protestant missionary work is carried out by societies which look with suspicion on co-operation with others whose principles are not exactly the same as their own. In certain regions it has been possible to

¹ Ellison, H. L., in *Frontier*, Summer 1959, pp. 122-3.

bring together such groups only on condition that they are not required to be related to the I.M.C., a far too miscellaneous body to meet with the approval of these cautious brethren. Thus, for instance, in Kenya in East Africa every single Protestant mission is associated with the Christian Council of Kenya, one of the best and most efficient of the councils set up in the lands of the younger churches; but this association is dependent on complete independence—at any suggestion that this Council should affiliate itself with any world body, a number of the associated missions would walk out. One of the councils which just trembled on the verge of the I.M.C. was the Council of the Congo. As a result of the Ghana decision in favor of integration, this Council has decided to withdraw from the I.M.C. During the summer of 1959, this example was followed by the Missions Council of Norway, which through a representative at the Ghana Assembly had already expressed its grave anxieties about the proposed scheme.

This may all seem rather remote and technical. But discussion of these issues is going to be very much in the air until the next Assembly of the World Council of Churches is held in Delhi in December, 1961; it is possible that a number of readers of this article may find themselves called to contribute to official decisions on the matter. If so, there is one weighty consideration that must always be held in mind. We have as yet little clear guidance on the question from the younger churches most affected. The representation of the younger churches at the Ghana Assembly was miserably small and inadequate as compared with Tambaram, 1938. But those who were present expressed themselves, almost without exception, as enthusiastically in favor of integration. It seems that in many regions there is a real division of opinion on this matter between the missionaries and their friends in the local churches. It has to be recognized that the younger churches dislike very much the name and the idea of "missions"; these seem to them to speak of the past, and of the time of alien and colonial domination. Where missionary influence is still very strong, it may be thrown against wider ecumenical union; where the younger church has a freer voice, the results may be different from those to be anticipated from the slightly gloomy picture that we have been bound to draw on the basis of the available documents.

Hard is the path of ecumenical advance. It might seem that the Joint Committee of the two ecumenical bodies had quite enough to put up with in being sniped at so effectively by Dr. Warren, Dr. Birkeli, and other friends in the more conservative camp. But this was far from being the end of it. In quite another quarter a number of hornets were beginning to

buzz audibly and angrily. The Orthodox Churches of the East dislike the word "missions" just as much as some leaders of the younger churches. As the Orthodox hardly have any missions of their own, they had never been present at international missionary gatherings. But now a new thing had happened. The Metropolitan James² of Melita, now Greek Archbishop in New York and a President of the World Council of Churches, but in 1958 special representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople in Geneva, was present at the Ghana Assembly of the I.M.C. The alert and watchful eye of this good friend of all the ecumenical leaders was on them all the time as they hatched their plans for integration. During the Assembly the Metropolitan James read out a statement expressing Orthodox views and anxieties about the proposed closer relations between the two large bodies. The Ecumenical Patriarchate, he affirmed

would never vote for any radical amendment of the W.C.C. Constitution nor would it be prepared to accept any change in the W.C.C. "ecclesiology" as declared in the well-known Toronto document. Finally the Ecumenical Patriarchate will insist on the two principles (a) that the sole aim of missions should be to reach peoples yet unconverted to Christ and never to proselytize among the members of the Christian churches and (b) that the "missions" should be "church missions" and should work for the up-building of the Church.³

A whole world of Christian history underlies these temperate words of the Metropolitan James.

The question of integration came up again at the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, held at Rhodes in August, 1959. Naturally Orthodox representation at the meeting was stronger than it has ever been before at such meetings, and a number of those present had not previously had any ecumenical education. It is not to be wondered at that once again anxiety was expressed at the idea of any closer association with those terrible and destructive bodies "the missions." Once again Archbishop James urged the World Council to remain what it is—a council of churches. The Metropolitan Parthenios of Carthage, of the Greek Patriarchate of Alexandria, said frankly, "For us Orthodox, the word 'mission' is something which we fear. I don't know why. It's my tradition. For this reason I say to you, Go slowly."⁴

It is almost certain that the integration of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council will be approved at the Assembly to be held in December, 1961. We have to face the possibility

² Greek spelling, "Iakovos."

³ *The Ghana Assembly of the International Missionary Council*, p. 163.

⁴ Ecumenical Press Service (Geneva), August 28, 1959, p. 6.

that if integration follows, the ecumenical movement of the future may be a truncated movement. It may lose, on the one hand, those of the Orthodox Churches which have so far supported it, and on the other the extremest evangelical churches which have been able to find a home directly or indirectly in the I.M.C. It would then stretch from the Old Catholics and Anglicans on the right to the Disciples of Christ and some of the Friends on the left. It would be able to speak for rather less than a quarter of the Christian world.

We have brought our record up to the latest possible date. It would be dishonest to refuse to face the fact that this record meets us with a grave and unanswered question: This is the way we have been following; is it the right way, and ought we to follow it further?

But this cannot be the last word.

In the first place, we must look back over the great positive achievements of ecumenical effort over half a century.

It is only by a great effort of imagination that the churchman of today can realize what things were like in 1910. At that date there was not in existence one single organization through which regular international Christian consultation and action were possible. Not only so; many of the greatest and wisest leaders in the church thought that it was impossible that such organizations could be brought into being, and that if it were possible it might not be desirable. Today a whole variety of organizations for thought, prayer, consultation and action exist, and have come to be taken for granted as part of the permanent machinery of the Christian world. We can hardly imagine what it would be like to be without any of them.

In consequence there has been a steady growing together of the churches in friendship and mutual understanding. The differences are still extremely grave. No attempt to minimize them has been made in these pages. Yet it is just the fact that the leaders of Christian thought and action across the world are better acquainted with one another personally, are more closely linked together by subtle and mysterious bonds of Christian friendship, than has ever been the case in earlier periods of the history of the church.

This moving together of the churches has expressed itself in this half-century by the formation of at least thirty-eight united churches. Some of these have been large, some small. Many attempts to unite the churches have ended in failure; others are still being carried forward in hope tempered by anxiety. What is certain is that never in the long centuries of the church's history has anything in the least like this happened before.

The nineteenth century was the great century of the church's expansion; so far the twentieth has been the great century of Christian union.

Even thirty years ago the word "ecumenism" was hardly known. "Ecumenical" was a headache to the journalists of the world and was constantly confused with "economical." Now at least the word is familiar. It is not true that the ordinary church member has any clear idea of what it is all about; but at the time of Evanston 1954, any American churchman who read any church paper, or indeed read any kind of paper at all, knew that something was happening in the Christian world, and that the churches were meeting in a way and on a scale that was without parallel in the previous history of the church.

All these are achievements of no mean magnitude. But what is yet to come is far more important than anything that has happened in the past.

It is still true that roughly half the people in the world have never even heard the name of Jesus Christ.

Does it matter? That question cannot be argued out in these pages. But, as Archbishop William Temple once remarked with his usual shattering capacity for putting the most important truths in the simplest language, "If the gospel is true for any man anywhere, it is true for all men everywhere." If the gospel is true at all, it is literally a matter of life and death for every man and woman now living in the world. When the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches said that the missionary movement must become more ecumenical and the ecumenical movement must become more missionary, he was pointing to the consequences that must follow from a recognition of these elementary truths.

Churches have sometimes lived inward-looking lives. They have been concerned with the guidance and sanctification of their own members only. In that case they have not really been churches of Jesus Christ, the Good Shepherd, who gave his life for the sheep. His church exists only as it is mission, only as it lives related to the end of the world and the end of time, only as it is turned outward to men and women in all the needs and tragedies and darkness of their daily lives.

If the churches really began to live in this way, they would find that they could not do without one another. Take any area of the world you like; all the churches together are far less than adequate to deal with the social needs of that area, whether it be the juvenile delinquents of the east side of New York or the immigrants who are streaming all the time from Eastern Germany into Western. A great deal of the work of the church goes undone just because we do not know how to work together.

Every church should live all the time in awareness of its membership in the great fellowship of all those who today literally from China to Peru call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior; and at the same time in awareness of the unfinished task that lies before them. If all the churches were to work together, to an intelligent and planned strategy, and were to multiply five-fold their giving in money and in man-power, they would still be inadequate to the task of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ to every creature.

To recognize these things means to live ecumenically, in awareness of the greatness of the vocation of the church, in shame at the weakness and misery caused by our divisions, in readiness for a greater call from God than we have ever yet heard. And for each individual Christian, awareness of these dimensions would mean a Christian life of an intensity and devotion such as usually lie beyond the horizons of our best imaginings. What this would mean has been so well expressed by Professor Walther Freytag of Hamburg, another of the great missionary thinkers of the world, in his address to the Ghana Assembly of the International Missionary Council, that no words can better serve as a conclusion:

It is an illustration only of what I said, that those who live in the obedience of faith are part of God's action. An illustration only, not the matter itself. This fact, that every Christian is a part of God's action toward his goal, has a much deeper meaning. . . . The decisions of God's action are made in our life with Christ. There, more than the decision about our personal destiny takes place. There it happens that the Holy Temple of God is being built to its consummation. It happens or it does not happen, therefore according to how we live with Christ or do not live with Christ, we are a part of God's mission or we stand in its way. Therefore the Christian life cannot be lived without the wide horizon, the view of the world which God has in mind, the world which God loves. There God's mission is going on and it will be disclosed at the Day of our Lord.⁵

⁵ *The Ghana Assembly*, p. 147.

The Holy Spirit and the Church

PHILIP S. WATSON

I. THE HOLY SPIRIT OF PROMISE

THE HOLY SPIRIT is frequently described in Scripture as the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Lord, or quite simply as the Spirit. The term "Holy Spirit" is rare in the Old Testament (only in Isa. 63:10f. and Ps. 51:11), commoner in intertestamental literature, and freely used in the New Testament. The idea of Spirit stands everywhere in marked contrast to "flesh," a term which represents the whole nature both of man and of other animate creatures in its frailty, transience and perishableness (Isa. 31:3, I Pet. 1:24f.); and which sometimes—as in St. Paul—has special reference to human nature as "fallen" and sinful (cf. Gal. 5:17ff.). The adjective "Holy" emphasizes the nature of the Spirit as belonging to God, the Holy One of Israel, and as contrasted with all other spirits, especially the evil and unclean. In the New Testament the Holy Spirit is intimately bound up with Jesus Christ, the Holy One of God, and can even be called the Spirit of Jesus (Acts 16:7) and the Spirit of Christ (Phil. 1:19, I Pet. 1:11, etc.).

The Spirit is the living presence and life-giving power of God, who is Spirit (John 4:24). He was first known in ancient Israel as the source of extraordinary endowments and achievements in men—feats of strength (Judg. 14:6), artistic skill (Exod. 31:3f.), military prowess (I Sam. 11:6f.), prophetic inspiration (I Sam. 10:10), capacity for government (Num. 11:16f.), kingly authority (I Sam. 16:13). He came to be recognized as operative in the creation (Gen. 1:2) and conservation (Job 34:14f.) of the world, and as the source of life in man and beast (Job 33:4, 32:8; Ps. 104:29f.). But his most important activity lay in the sphere of prophetic inspiration. It was in and through Moses and the prophets that God "put his holy Spirit in the midst of" Israel (Isa. 63:11) and "gave them his good

PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A., B.D., D.D., formerly Tutor at Wesley House, Cambridge, England, is now Professor of Systematic Theology at Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois. This article is based upon a paper prepared for the European Section of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church (W.C.C., Faith and Order) in 1956, and presented to the Joint Meeting of the American and European Sections at Yale Divinity School, July, 1957.

Spirit to instruct them" (Neh. 9:20), so that the Spirit was present with every pious soul (Ps. 51:11). And when the last of the old prophets had come and gone, there remained a collection of "inspired" writings, the Holy Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets, which could be quoted as utterances of the Holy Spirit and as the very Word of God (Heb. 3:7, 10:15; Mark 12:36; Acts 28:25). But Israel again and again "rebelled and grieved his holy Spirit" (Isa. 63:10; Acts 7:51f.), being disobedient to the Word spoken through Moses and the prophets (Exod. 33:3, 5; Num. 27:14; Jer. 6:10, 28). They were possessed by a spirit of unfaithfulness (Hos. 4:12, 5:4), and they broke the Covenant that God had made with them. In consequence disaster overtook them, culminating in the Exile and the Dispersion. Disobedience brought death to Israel, and the destruction of their nationhood.

Yet God remained faithful, and he gave through the prophets a hope and promise of redemption. The People of God should be gathered out of the Dispersion, and the dry bones of Israel should have new life infused into them by the life-giving Spirit of God. The time would come when he would make a new Covenant with them, under which sins should be forgiven and hearts changed (Jer. 31:31f.). He would give them a new heart and a new spirit by putting his own Spirit, not only "in the midst of them," but "within" them, so that they should become obedient to his will and live (Ezek. 36:26f., 37:14). Messiah should come, anointed with the abiding fullness of the Spirit, to rule over them in righteousness and peace (Isa. 11:1ff.; Ezek. 37:24ff.); and there should be an outpouring of the Spirit not only on the chosen prophetic few, but "on all flesh" (Joel 2:28f.)—as if in fulfillment of Moses' wish "that all the Lord's people were prophets" (Num. 11:29). Furthermore, the life-giving influence of the Spirit would extend, through the anointed Servant of the Lord, beyond the confines of Israel to the Gentiles (Isa. 42:1ff., 61:1ff.), and even beyond the world of men to the world of nature (Isa. 11:6ff., 32:15ff.; Ezek. 34:24ff.).

II. THE ISRAEL OF GOD

Turning now to the second part of our theme, the Church, we naturally think first of the *ecclesia* of God and of Jesus Christ, of which the New Testament speaks. But in order rightly to understand it, we must bear in mind its connection with the *qahal* or *ecclesia*¹ of Israel, or of the Lord, spoken of in the Old Testament. It is not without significance that in the New Testament ancient Israel is referred to as "the *ecclesia* in the wilder-

¹ The Septuagint renders *qahal* by *ecclesia*, the English versions by "congregation."

ness" (Acts 7:38) and the Christian *ecclesia* as "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16).

Israel is the chosen People of God, an elect race, with whom God entered into a covenant relation at the very beginning of their history. He chose them, and established his covenant with them, not for any virtue of theirs, but because of his unfathomable love for them (Deut. 7:7). His choice of them was evidenced by his mighty acts of grace on their behalf: historical events, of which the Exodus was the outstanding example. To such events the prophets continually appealed when they sought to bring home the fact of Divine election as a rebuke for the sins or a comfort for the sorrows of Israel. Because God in his love had chosen them, his people clearly owed him loving loyalty and obedience in return; and equally because he had chosen them, they could be sure that he would not allow his purpose for them to be frustrated, if only for the sake of his own good name. Thus election involved responsibility as well as privilege, and it also meant that Israel's history had a meaning and a goal. God had chosen them in order that he might dwell with them and be their God, and they his people; and that through them even the Gentiles might come to the knowledge of God (Ezek. 37:26ff., 38:23).

It is true that Israel as a whole responded badly to God's electing love. Again and again the People of God had to be severely disciplined, and at times so severely that it seemed as if God had utterly repudiated them. Yet there was always "a remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. 11:5); there were always some, whether many or few, who received the Word of the Lord spoken through the prophets, and who thus furnished a ground of hope for the future. For even when all that remained of Israel seemed no more than the stump of a felled tree, yet the stump was never uprooted, and there was always the possibility that new life might spring from it. Indeed, God promised that this should happen; there should come forth a Righteous Branch, which should bear the fruit God had hitherto looked for in vain from his people (Isa. 11:1; Jer. 23:5, 33:15; Zech. 3:8, 6:12). That is to say, there was promised to the Remnant of Israel the Messiah, who should gather them out of the Dispersion, establish them in the true worship and service of God, and thereby make a way of salvation open also to the Gentiles (Jer. 23:3ff.; Mic. 5:2ff.; Ezek. 37:21ff.; Isa. 2:2ff.; Mic. 4:1ff.; Zech. 14:16; cf. Isa. 25:6ff.; 51:4f.).

It is this Remnant of Israel that is the true Israel, the true People of God; and it is with this Remnant that the Christian *ecclesia* identifies itself when it calls itself the Israel of God. Israel and the Church are one and the

same People of God, to whom the promises of God were first given, and to whom they are now being fulfilled. Messiah has come, the New Covenant has been established, the Spirit poured out. It is true that the Israelite *ecclesia* appears to have rejected Christ, but we must understand that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel" (Rom. 9:6)—and they never were. Even from the beginning, it was not physical descent from Abraham that mattered, but the electing grace and faithful promise of God; and the true People of God are not those born after the flesh, but those born after the Spirit (Gal. 4:29). Israel after the flesh has always resisted the Holy Spirit, and those who crucified Christ only take after their fathers, who persecuted the prophets that foretold him (Acts 7:51ff.). Yet the promises of God, and his purpose in electing Israel, are not thereby brought to nought. There is still a Remnant according to the election of grace, and a Remnant which is being enlarged by the incorporation of Gentiles into it; for the latter are but new slips engrafted into the ancient tree of Israel, from which some of the native branches have been broken off (Rom. 11:17ff.).

In the light of all this, it is not difficult to understand how the Christian *ecclesia* can claim for itself the titles and prerogatives of the Israel of God. It is described as an elect race, a holy nation, a kingdom of priests (I Pet. 2:5, 9; Exod. 19:5f.), a people for God's own possession (Eph. 1:14; Tit. 2:14). Gentiles admitted to it are brought into the commonwealth of Israel and made partakers of the covenants of promise (Eph. 2:11). Its members are true children of Abraham, because they live by the same faith as Abraham (Rom. 4, Gal. 3); they are children of promise and spiritual kinsfolk of Isaac (Gal. 4:28). They are called saints and the elect (Phil. 1:1; I Pet. 1:2); they were chosen by God before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4); and they were chosen for salvation, through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth (II Thess. 2:13).

III. THE LORD'S ANOINTED

The beginning of the fulfillment of the promises of God is with the coming of Jesus Christ, and with this the Holy Spirit is associated from the outset. The birth of Jesus was heralded, according to St. Luke, by a fresh outburst of prophecy in true Old Testament style (Luke 1:41, 67ff.; 2:25f., 36), and his forerunner, John the Baptist, was to be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb (Luke 1:15). The conception of Jesus was due, according to two of our Evangelists, to the direct action of the Holy Spirit—whence also Jesus himself is called holy (Matt. 1:18, Luke 1:35). Here we have the inception of the New Creation, in which the

Spirit of God is the Giver of life, as he was already in the old (Gen. 1:2).

Then, at his baptism in Jordan, Jesus was "anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power" (Acts 10:38), and all four Gospels agree in associating this gift of the Spirit with a dove. The symbolism of the dove is obscure: some connect it with the voice from heaven, the *bath qol*, which the Rabbis likened to the cooing of a dove; some identify it with Noah's dove (Gen. 8:6ff.), as signifying the dawn of a new era; some refer to the bird-like brooding of the Spirit at creation (Gen. 1:2) as repeated at the New Creation; some think that, as Israel can be symbolized by a dove (*jonah*), Jesus is here marked out as the true Israel. However that may be, the significance of the gift of the Spirit is clear: Jesus is the Messiah, the Lord's Anointed, equipped with the divine power he needs for his Messianic mission. The accompanying voice from heaven indicates the nature of this mission by combining a reference to the royal Son of God with an allusion to the Suffering Servant of the Lord (Mark 1:11; cf. Ps. 2:7, Isa. 42:1). The Messiah-Son-Servant of the Lord is thus the bearer of the Holy Spirit, as he himself claims (Matt. 12:18f., Luke 4:18ff.). He has the Spirit, moreover, not as a fluctuating, intermittent gift, as men have had it before him, but as an abiding possession (John 1:32f.); and he will in due course, as John the Baptist says, impart the same gift to others (Mark 1:8, par.). But the general outpouring of the Spirit will not take place until he has fulfilled his mission, or as the Fourth Gospel says, until he has been "glorified" (John 7:39).

Immediately after his baptism, Jesus is led (Matt., Luke) or driven (Mark) by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. That is to say, there is a trial of strength between the bearer of the Holy Spirit and the prince of all unholy spirits. A Second Adam meets the Evil One in the wilderness as the first had met him in the Garden; and the Second Adam prevails where the first had succumbed. But the temptation in the wilderness is only the first encounter between the two antagonists. Jesus sees Satan at work everywhere, and is continually in conflict with him. This is brought into particularly sharp focus when he exorcises "unclean spirits," which he regards as manifestations of Satan's power. In the so-called Beelzebub controversy, he declares that he casts out demons by the Spirit of God (Matt. 12:28), or the finger of God (Luke 11:20), which means the same thing. From one point of view, the whole work of Jesus can be understood as a Messianic assault on the kingdom of Satan, carried out in the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 10:38). And of course there is counter-attack by Satan, indirectly through the enemies of Jesus (John

8:44), more subtly through his friends (Matt. 16:23), and finally through Judas (Luke 22:3) and the pain and shame of the cross. But just by accepting the cross, Jesus refuses to yield to the tempter, and so even here he prevails. In consequence, after fulfilling the role of the Servant in suffering and humiliation, he is "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1:4). The Spirit thus plays his part also in the exaltation of the Messiah.

Then follows Pentecost and the promised Messianic outpouring of the Spirit, which is accomplished through Jesus, whom God has made both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:30ff.). The relation of this to the preceding events might perhaps be expressed by saying that the New Covenant, having been duly signed and sealed with the blood of Christ, is now delivered by him. It is delivered to those whom he has prepared to receive it (Acts 1:4f.), namely the band of disciples whom he has attached to himself as the nucleus of a revived Remnant of Israel, through whom it is to be published to all the world (Acts 1:8). It is delivered, moreover, on the traditional anniversary of the establishment of the Old Covenant at Sinai; and as then, so now, there is a manifestation of the Divine glory. The rushing wind and leaping flames proclaim the living presence of God and the fulfillment of his promise that he would come to dwell with his Israel. The mingled company of devout Jews from every nation under heaven marks the beginning of the promised gathering of the Dispersion; and the mention of proselytes points to the inclusion of the Gentiles, which is more fully realized at the renewed Pentecost in the house of Cornelius later on (Acts 10:44f.). The double miracle of speech and understanding (Acts 2:4, 8) is the reversal of Babel and the fulfillment of the Divine promise to "turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent" (Zeph. 3:9).

As the Transfiguration of Jesus momentarily revealed the glory into which he was to enter through sufferings (Luke 9:28ff.), so we may perhaps think of the Pentecostal happenings as a momentary disclosure of the destined character of the church, a fleeting anticipation of the Parousia of Christ and the revealing of the sons of God (1 John 3:2; Rom. 8:9; Luke 1:33, 2:14; Rev. 21-22). The immediate result of it was a powerful preaching of the Word of God, whereby multitudes were added to the church and all were joined together in a quite idyllic fellowship (Acts 2:41ff.). The glory of that day, it is true, did not last; yet there remained a living reminder of it in the *arrhabon*, the "earnest" of the Spirit constantly

renewed (Eph. 1:14), which has ever since furnished both a firm ground of hope for the future glory, and a fervent desire for the present fellowship, of the People of God.

IV. THE TEMPLE OF HIS BODY

The Christian community is likened in the New Testament to a temple (*naos*) in which the Holy Spirit dwells, and which therefore itself is holy (I Cor. 3:16f.). It is a building that is being raised "for a habitation of God in the Spirit"; it is founded on the apostles and prophets, with Christ himself as the chief cornerstone; and in it Gentiles have equal rights with Jews (Eph. 2:19ff.). It is a "spiritual house," into which Christians are built as living stones, and within which they serve as a holy priesthood, offering spiritual sacrifices to God and proclaiming his wonderful deeds (I Pet. 2:4ff.).

This conception doubtless goes back to Jesus himself. He had spoken critically of the temple at Jerusalem (Mark 13:2, John 4:23f.), and had carried out a cleansing of it, asserting its true use as "a house of prayer for all nations" (Mark 11:15). He was subsequently accused of having threatened to destroy it, and in three days to build another temple, "not made with hands" (Mark 14:58). But what he had actually said, according to the Fourth Gospel, referred to "the temple of his body" (John 2:21). In other words, he had declared that the existing temple would be superseded by "something greater than the temple" (Matt. 12:6). There was to be a different expression of God's presence among men, namely his own body. His body was to be broken, his flesh offered in sacrifice for the life of the world and the feeding of his disciples (John 6:50ff.); and these would then come to constitute his body in another sense—through the action of the Spirit (John 6:63).

Hence the church is called the Body of Christ. If it is not called a spiritual body (as the temple is a spiritual house), it could very well be so, seeing that the Holy Spirit dwells in it. It is the body of the Second Adam, who himself is a life-giving Spirit (I Cor. 15:45); and from him as the Head, the body derives its life (Eph. 4:16, Col. 2:19). It is the New Man, a new creation, in which the division between Jew and Gentile (not to mention Greek and barbarian, male and female, bond and free) is overcome because both have access in one Spirit to the Father (Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10; II Cor. 5:17; Eph. 2:18).

With the Body of Christ may be contrasted another, which is described as the body of the flesh, of sin, and of death (Col. 2:11; Rom. 6:6, 7:24).

This is the body of fallen, sinful humanity, the old man, of which all men are members by nature. It is a body racked and torn by manifold unholy spirits, diverse manifestations of satanic power, with the result that "in Adam all die." In Christ, on the other hand, "shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 15:22), since in his Body his holy and life-giving Spirit flows to every member, so that those who form "one body in Christ" (Rom. 12:5) can also be said to be "one Spirit with him" (I Cor. 6:17), and their own individual bodies can be described as temples of the Holy Spirit (6:19). In this way Christ lives in them as they live in Christ, and the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus frees them from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2).

The Spirit, moreover, imparts to the different members of the Body of Christ a considerable diversity of gifts and graces (*charismata*) which are intended, not for private use or enjoyment, but "for the work of ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ" (I Cor. 12:4ff.; Eph. 4:7ff.). For the temple of Christ's body is as yet only in process of construction and growth; it has to be built up both by the incorporation of new members and by the deepening and strengthening of its inner life. To this end it is most necessary to preserve "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3), and nearly all that is said in the New Testament about the Body of Christ emphasizes this point. But the need for unity is more easily stated than fulfilled, even in New Testament times. For the new man is being fashioned, as it were, out of the old, and the Body of Christ is a body of people, who in themselves are quite ordinary, sinful people and by no means wholly spiritual as yet. Hence they have to be warned not to quench or grieve the Spirit, and exhorted to walk by the Spirit and resist the flesh (I Thess. 5:19; Eph. 4:30; Gal. 5:16; Rom. 8:5ff.). They must also be warned against the spiritual pride that "puffs up," and urged to seek instead love, which "builds up" (I Cor. 8:1), and which is the greatest of all the gifts of the Spirit.

In this context it is appropriate to emphasize the close connection in New Testament thought between the Spirit and the Body. Spirituality and corporeality are in no way antagonistic. The corporeal can be indwelt by the spiritual which seeks expression in and through it. If there is conflict, it is between different spirits, the holy and the unholy, which both strive for possession and control of the body. Even the flesh is not necessarily antagonistic to the Spirit; the two are opposed only in so far as the flesh has become the unhallowed tool of an evil spirit. Hence there is no necessary opposition between the action of men and that of the Spirit. Indeed, the two can at times be virtually identified. Elders appointed by the apostles

are appointed by the Holy Spirit (Acts 14:23, 20:28); in trying to deceive the apostles, Ananias and Sapphira lie to the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:3, 9); the words of Christian prophets, like those of Old Testament times, are utterances of the Holy Spirit (Acts 11:28; Rev. 2:7 etc.; Acts 7:51f.; Heb. 10:15; I Pet. 1:12).

Anything, in fact, that is said or done by any member of the Body of Christ, can be attributed to the Spirit (or to Christ himself), provided it is said or done in obedience to the will of the Head and under the impulsion of his Spirit—just as the movements of my tongue or hand must be attributed to me. It can, of course, happen that through injury or illness my limbs are not wholly under my control, so that their movements do not express my will; and something similar is true of the Body of Christ. His members can be influenced and moved by other spirits than his Holy Spirit, and even an apostle is not immune from such influence (Gal. 2:11ff.). It therefore becomes necessary for us to be able to try the spirits, whether they are of God (I John 4:1), and to this point we shall later return.

V. THE COMMUNION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

But how do men become partakers of the Holy Spirit? How is the Spirit communicated to them?

One answer to these questions is suggested by St. Paul's question to the Galatians: "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal. 3:2), and his remark elsewhere that "faith cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ" (Rom. 10:17). The Spirit is received by hearing and believing the message concerning Christ, the gospel or the Word of God.²

The Spirit is very closely linked in Scripture with the Word, and sometimes the two are virtually identified (Gen. 1:2; Ps. 33:6; II Thess. 2:8—Isa. 11:4; John 6:63; cf. Deut. 8:3—Matt. 4:4). Their relation is conceived on the analogy of speech and breath; for as breath without speech, so the Spirit without the Word would be formless, and as speech without breath, so the Word without the Spirit would be powerless. The Spirit is thus the vitalizing energy of the Word, and the Word is the instrument, the "sword" of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17; Heb. 4:12), which cleaves a way, as it were, for the Spirit to enter. In this connection we may recall that the Word of God, spoken in time past at sundry times and in divers manners

² Just as, for example, the "spirit of Communism" is received by hearing or reading Communist propaganda and believing it. Only believers receive the spirit, and the more firmly they believe, the more the spirit takes possession of them.

(Heb. 1:1), was associated with fluctuating and intermittent operations of the Spirit; and now that there has come the fuller utterance of the Word in Christ, there naturally comes also a fuller outpouring of the Spirit. An immediate result of this outpouring, moreover, is the powerful proclamation of the Word (Acts 2; cf. Acts 9:20ff.; I Cor. 2:4; I Thess. 1:5), whereby those who heard and believed it also received the Spirit. Jesus' promise that his disciples should receive power (Acts 1:8) was thus fulfilled, together with the Baptist's prophecy that Jesus himself would baptize with the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8, par.).

But the gift of the Spirit was associated at Pentecost with baptism in water (Acts 2:38), as it was when Jesus himself was baptized, and as it generally is in the New Testament. It is true that there is no mention of the baptism of the apostles at Pentecost, but it can hardly be doubted that they had received the same water-baptism as their Lord, whose Spirit-baptism was now extended to them. Otherwise St. Peter could hardly have urged baptism for his hearers in the way that he did. But this does not mean that there is a fixed and automatic connection between baptism and the reception of the Spirit. For although in the New Testament the two usually appear to coincide, there are a number of well-known instances where they do not; and in some cases the imparting of the Spirit is associated with the imposition of hands (Acts 8:14ff; 9:17ff.; 19:2ff.). Through the imposition of hands, moreover, additional and special endowments of the Spirit can be given for specific purposes (Acts 13:3ff; II Tim. 1:6). Nevertheless, there is a particularly close relation between baptism and the Holy Spirit, even where the activity of the Spirit is unrecognized and the gift of the Spirit unappropriated by the baptized.

Baptism with water in the name of Christ and of God is an essentially spiritual event. For not only is water an appropriate and scriptural symbol of the Spirit (Isa. 44:3f.; John 7:37), but its use in accordance with the will of Christ (Matt. 28:19) can well be an instrument and vehicle of the Spirit. Actions sometimes speak at any rate as loudly as words, and just as the spirit of a man finds expression not only in what he says but also in what he does, so the Spirit of God can find expression in corporeal acts involving the use of physical objects. Such acts—together with the spoken words that always accompany and interpret them—furnish a dramatic presentation of the gospel, which equally with the preaching of the gospel is a form of the Word of God, and therefore a vehicle of the Spirit. Furthermore, the very performance of such acts must be regarded as an activity of the Holy Spirit himself, carried out through the instrumentality of men whom he moves

thereto. Hence the corporeal rite of baptism with water is a spiritual event.

According to St. Paul, it was in or by the one Holy Spirit that we were all baptized into one body, the Body of Christ (I Cor. 12:13). That is to say, by that corporeal act of the Spirit, which is baptism, we were incorporated as members into the Body of Christ, which is the Church. The precise significance and implications of this event can be expressed in a considerable variety of ways. Baptism can be referred to as the "seal" of the Spirit, which stamps us as belonging to Christ (Eph. 1:13; 4:30). Or it can be spoken of as a new birth, brought about by water and the Spirit, in contrast to our natural birth from the flesh (John 3:5f.; Tit. 3:5). For as by our natural birth we are children of Adam and members of his sinful, mortal body, so by our baptism we are made members of the Body of Christ, and thereby children of God as sharers in Christ's sonship—an idea that can also be expressed in terms of adoption. Nothing essentially different from this is meant when it is said that in our baptism we died and rose again with Christ (Rom. 6:4ff.; Col. 2:11ff.), that we stripped off the old man and put on the new (Col. 3:9f.), or that we were "washed . . . sanctified . . . justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (I Cor. 6:11).

To be incorporated into the Body of Christ is to become in some real sense participant in all that belongs to Christ, including his Spirit. For his Body is the temple of the Spirit, and the sphere of the *koinonia* of the Spirit (II Cor. 13:14)—which means both participation in the Spirit and also the fellowship created thereby. At the heart of this spiritual *koinonia* we find again, as we might expect, a corporeal rite: the communion (*koinonia*) of the Body and Blood of Christ (I Cor. 10:16). Here bread and wine, used in accordance with the command of the Lord, are called spiritual food and drink. This does not mean, of course, either that the eucharistic elements are dematerialized or that they possess any miraculous or supernatural qualities: it means simply that they are taken into the service of the Spirit as a means of his self-communication to men. It remains true, as St. John says, that the flesh profiteth nothing, and only the Spirit gives life (John 6:63); yet at the same time, the flesh and blood of the Son of Man are meat indeed and drink indeed (6:55), because of the life-giving Spirit that is in him and therefore also in them.

VI. THE LAW OF THE SPIRIT OF LIFE

The Holy Spirit can be described as Christ's *alter ego* (John 14:18; 16:22), through whom the risen and exalted Lord continues and universal-

izes the work of redemption that he decisively accomplished in the body of his flesh (Col. 1:22). The Spirit enables us, who have not seen Christ, yet have believed (John 20:29), to have fellowship with him and to know it (I John 3:24; 4:13). Manifest signs and means of the Spirit's presence and activity among men are the Word and Sacraments of the gospel, whereby he seeks to gain entry into the hearts and minds of men. Not that his activity is limited to these means, for he is universally at work throughout creation, and even in the work of redemption he must not be thought of as restricted to occasions of public preaching and the administration of sacramental rites. Yet these are certainly of outstanding importance, since the whole *koinonia* of the Body of Christ is centered in them; and the more purely and faithfully the Word is preached and the Sacraments are administered, the more effectively they will serve the Spirit's purpose.

What the Spirit seeks, as has just been said, is to gain entry into men's hearts and minds; for it is the good pleasure of God, not only to dwell *with* men, but *in* them, imparting to them his own eternal life. Unless this happens, they remain victims of the corrupting, destroying "spirit of the world" (I Cor. 2:12), under whose power all who are born of Adam's flesh are subjected to the law of sin and death. This spirit is called the father of lies (John 8:44) and the spirit of error (I John 4:6), the spirit of bondage and fear (Rom. 8:15), the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience (Eph. 2:2). By contrast, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, of sonship, of liberty, and above all, of love (John 16:13; Rom. 8:15; II Cor. 3:17; Rom. 5:5). In the light of this contrast, it becomes possible for us to test the spirits that find various expression in human life, to see whether they are of God (I John 4:1).

The Holy Spirit bears witness to the truth as it is in Jesus, the truth of God in Jesus Christ (John 15:26, Eph. 4:20f.). He leads the disciples of Jesus into all the truth (John 16:13ff.), recalling to them the teaching of Jesus (John 14:26) and giving them insight into the deeper and wider implications of his words and works (John 16:14; Eph. 3:4ff.; I Cor. 2:6ff., 10). One major consequence of this is that we now possess the Scriptures of the New Testament, containing the apostolic witness to Christ which is the very witness of the Holy Spirit himself (John 16:26f.; Acts 5:32). Here we have a decisive touchstone by which to "try the spirits." Nothing that is at variance with the truth as it is in Jesus can be Christian truth and an utterance of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 12:3; I John 4:2f.).

The Holy Spirit bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God (Rom. 8:16). For God predestined us for adoption as sons (Eph.

1:5), and in the fullness of time sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption (Gal. 4:4f.); and now, because we are sons, he has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying "Abba, Father." That is to say, having been adopted in Christ, as members of his Body, we are enabled by the Spirit to realize our privilege, and to approach God with the same child-like confidence as Jesus did. This is the privilege of all, Jew and Gentile alike (Eph. 2:18), who are led by the Spirit of God (Rom. 8:14). But anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him (Rom. 8:9); for he has given to all who receive him, who believe in his name, power to become children of God (John 1:12).

The Holy Spirit imparts many gifts to men, but chief of them all is love (I Cor. 13). Love is the first of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22f.), God's own love, shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit given unto us (Rom. 5:5). This is the perfect love that casts out fear (I John 4:18), and that impels us to love, as knowing that we are loved (4:10f.). It evokes an answering love toward God, which finds expression in love for our fellow men; and this is perhaps the chief test of the Spirit's effectual working in us. For "if anyone says 'I love God,' and hates his brother, he is a liar" (4:20). The Spirit of truth and the Spirit of love are one and the same, for the God who is Spirit is love (4:8, 16).

The Holy Spirit is also, finally, the Spirit of liberty. He sets us free from the "letter that kills," the law of sin and death (II Cor. 3; Rom. 8:2). He does so by making our mortal bodies, as members of Christ's body, his own dwelling place, and delivering us thereby from the grip of the unholy spirit that reigns in the body of the flesh, the Adamic body of sin and death. That body and its members are under the curse of the law, because the mind of the flesh is hostile to God, and those who are in the flesh cannot please God (Rom. 8:7f.). But as members of the Body of Christ we are not under the law, but under grace (Rom. 6:14), and not in the flesh but in the Spirit—provided the Spirit really dwells in us (Rom. 8:9). That is to say, we are no longer under the condemnation of the law, and we have the power to fulfill the law—if we avail ourselves of it (Rom. 8:1, 4). Hence, if we live by the Spirit, we must walk by the Spirit; the liberty we have in Christ must not become license, but must be used for the service of one another in love (Gal. 5:25, 13).

VII. THE EARNEST OF OUR INHERITANCE

It must not be forgotten that the members of the Body of Christ are at the same time still members of the body of the flesh and of Adam. If

they are not in the flesh in one sense, they are in another (cf. Gal. 2:20; II Cor. 4:11). Although in their baptism they have put off the body of the flesh (Col. 2:11) and put on Christ (Gal. 3:27), or put off the old man and put on the new (Col. 3:9f.), they have not yet perfectly done either, and they must be exhorted to do both (Eph. 4:22ff.). They have died and risen with Christ (Col. 2:12), yet must mortify their members on earth (Col. 3:5) and seek to attain the resurrection of the dead (Phil. 3:10ff.). For their perishable nature must put on the imperishable, their mortal immortality, before their redemption is complete (I Cor. 15:53). Hence, although they have received the Spirit of adoption, yet they wait and long for their adoption, namely the redemption of their bodies (Rom. 8:15, 23).

There is thus ceaseless tension between the two orders of existence, in Adam and in Christ, in the flesh and in the Spirit (Gal. 5:17). There is, indeed, ceaseless conflict between them. But this, it should be emphasized, is not a conflict between the Church as the People of God and the rest of mankind. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against . . . spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. 6:12). It is a warfare in which we are enlisted by the Holy Spirit against all unholy spirits, wheresoever they are found—and they can be found even among the people of God, and within our own individual selves. This warfare is nothing else but a continuation of the conflict in which Christ himself fought the decisive battle in his encounters with Satan, and it will not come to a final end until the last battle has been fought, and the last enemy overcome, which is death itself (I Cor. 15:26). Only in the resurrection of the dead will the conflict be finally past, and our redemption complete.

But the decisive victory has been won through the cross and the resurrection of Christ, and a foretaste of the resurrection life is given us in the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit in our hearts is the *arrhabon*, the earnest of what is to come, the pledge and assurance of final victory and our participation in it (II Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:14). For if the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwells in us, then he will quicken also our mortal bodies (Rom. 8:11). In hope of this the whole creation waits with eager longing, groaning and travailing till it comes to pass, just as we ourselves do; nay, even the very Spirit of God himself groans on our behalf (Rom. 8:22-27). The Spirit's work in and through the Church, the Body of Christ and its members, thus gives promise of a renewed and transfigured universe—"new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (II Pet. 3:13).

The Church As Educator

WESNER FALLAW

WHAT TERM best denotes the kind of educational endeavor needed in Protestant churches? Increasing concern to articulate theological foundations for education at the local church level and a desire to be specific about our task have combined to cause dissatisfaction with the term "religious education" as applied to teaching-learning programs in the churches. The terms "Christian education" and "Christian religious education" are often used, but church-related colleges still carry on Christian education, and to speak of Christian religious education is somewhat awkward and redundant. "Christian nurture," despite rich connotations, has had at least a century to catch the fancy of term-makers and users of terms, yet it has hardly done so—possibly because the word "nurture" conveys little meaning to the public mind, or perhaps because Horace Bushnell's theology has never been generally accepted. And of course others besides Protestants address themselves to Christian education, to Christian nurture.

What have we left that is clearly ours? H. Shelton Smith and Harry C. Munro speak of Protestant nurture. This is precise. This is what we are engaged in, Protestant nurture; yet this, too, presents difficulties. Students of this discipline and workers in the field have been willing to be called educators, or religious educators, or Christian educators, but who wants to be known as a Protestant nurturer? Directors of religious education, ministers of Christian education, plain educational directors, yes—though it has been far from easy over the years to be explicit about these titles.

Another designation for our chosen discipline occurs to me, and while it, too, is not entirely satisfactory, it has some advantages. It is "church education."

I

By church education I mean a teaching-learning enterprise, grounded in theology and Scripture, whose goal is that of enabling persons to learn

WESNER FALLAW, M.A., Ed.D., is Professor of Religious Education at Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts. This article is taken from a chapter of his forthcoming book, *Church Education for Tomorrow*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960. Copyright © 1960 by W. L. Jenkins.

of God through Christ as experienced in Christian community, the church.

Prof. Paul H. Vieth says that the purposes of the church and its education are the same.¹ Agreed. And a notable study of theological education expresses the purpose of the church as that of increasing the love of God and neighbor.² Prof. Howard Grimes, following the late Prof. Lewis J. Sherrill, places nurture within the context of the church redemptive. And so do others, particularly Randolph Crump Miller and his disciples, believing as they do that education for Christian living derives from life within the church, a faith-grace relationship. How shall we view the church?

Paul's conception of it as the body of Christ is fruitful for our thinking—provided we don't become disconcerted by trying to equate a particular church with this imagery. Being members one of another, gathered and knit together by faith in Christ—confident that he discloses the God who loves us—we are organically related, sustained by this knitting and joining as members of a whole greater than our individual selves or even than the sum of all the individuals composing it. Our creation is such that there is no meaning, no growth, no sustenance apart from some sort of union, some continuing relationship that overcomes isolation and provides fulfillment for the individual.

But there are drawbacks to this image of the church. Though we speak of the mystical body of Christ, the word "body" almost inevitably is taken too literally, with a physiological connotation. And likening persons to the parts of a body diminishes them.

A person is always an integer, something of a whole, with a certain autonomy, possessing freedom to approach other persons, and freedom to withdraw, either commingling with them in communion or in part insulating himself from other selves. One *chooses* to commingle, *decides* to relate himself to other people, is free to do so, and free not to do so. We are not forced to be subject to our brothers; never are we compelled against our wills to enter the larger freedom of being members one of another. To be human, to be created in God's image, is to have the final say as to whether or not we shall enter into fellowship one with another and with God. Nevertheless, we deny our creation and stunt our growth if we elect to be a stranger, separated from others and alienated from God. We need community as earth needs its atmosphere. And for overcoming alienation from our fellows and God, both community and communion

¹ Cf. *The Church School*, Christian Education Press, 1957, p. 18.

² Niebuhr, H. Richard, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry*, Harper & Brothers, 1956, p. 31.

are essential. Created for community with our fellows, we are fashioned in the image of God and dependent upon communion with him as he, in the Holy Spirit, dwells in his church.

It may be said categorically that the life of the church—the quality of living and worshiping and acting and thinking of a particular church—educates individuals and the fellowship as a whole. This education is a process of growth in Christ, available for all ages and carried on informally as well as formally, incidentally as well as intentionally, unconsciously as well as deliberately. The church is requisite for growth in grace and knowledge of our Lord, for anyone—young or old—and for all groups, children's classes no less than adults' societies. In the informed and purposive church, persons are understood and materials of instruction are selected with the clear intent to bring about individual and corporate experiences with God. Experience is the key word here, and the dominant desire of the church is to create relationships wherein the God of Christ is met, apprehended, worshiped.

The church that advances its mission as educator is dedicated to expending intelligent effort in helping its children, youth, and adults to love God with their minds, and hearts, and with all the given and learned powers of their whole being, powers of perception and devotion. The church as educator does not leave to God the whole job of nurturing people. Helping people to grow Godward is a human responsibility, a vocation, mutually undertaken by all gathered in the church. As educator, the church knows that God acts first, in love seeking and inviting his creatures to enter into redemptive relations with him. But more than simple human response to divine action is involved; creative interaction marks redemptive relationship—not dull reaction on our part, but profound experience in which God and we, his creatures, commune together. On the human level, this communion means relationship, the nature of which is quite other than one's acting and another's merely responding.

So, also, with relationship on the divine-human level. I am persuaded to believe that a theological position that leaves all the initiative up to God belittles his creatures. We humans can do more than respond, though assuredly we may do no less. Indeed, if God really has fashioned us, he has endowed us with initiative, nor can I suppose that he expects us to express initiative in every life situation except with respect to him. Rather, I believe he endows us with initiative to be used and invites us to engage in creative communion with him by means of interrelationship.

This is not to say that relationship with God permits human willfulness

or presumption. Humans dare not attempt to impinge on the Almighty. What I do wish to say emphatically is that creative communion between God and those who would know him—loving him with their whole mind—is the occasion not only for worship and enjoyment but also for critical inquiry. It is a kind of testing of the validity of God's truth in so far as human intelligence and experience permit. So it is that one who either questions in order that he may know, or voices sincere religious doubt, is to be regarded as being on the threshold of what may become his own very personal, very meaningful experience with God, provided only that churchmen—lay and cleric—have the grace to show the seeker and the doubter that persons in Christ are knit and joined together in true relationship.

II

True relationship means love of God and neighbor. The nurture process develops this love by means of growth in grace and knowledge guided by the church. From an educational perspective growth is always sought as the one indispensable aim and process. From the biblical perspective this growth in knowledge denotes personal communion with Christ. A doctrine of the church may well argue that not knowledge about Christ so much as experience with him is sought. To experience God is to worship him, and the church is a worshipping community. It is also a community of inquiry, an environment productive of human and divine interaction.

This word "interaction" requires explication. In this context it may be defined as contact of personality with personalities, involvement of persons with each other and the Person of Christ, during which there is a flow of concern—power and spirit and meaning—between God and his creatures, the divine entering into humans, humans touching their God. Does he not still rejoice with us, on occasion grieve over us, and strive with us as with his Galilean companions?

If you shrink from this line of thought, fearing that it leads to a demeaning of the Absolute, of him who is perfect, I reply that the God who opens himself to communing with us remains the Absolute, the same yesterday and today; he never takes on our relative natures. But he is the God of Christ, this same Jesus Christ who was tempted like ourselves but who, unlike us, yielded not to temptation. And our God is nearer than hands and feet, never far off, for he enters into relationship with us. Of course he is other than man, yet if we had the wisdom of the child, we would know that he is with us, among us, acting upon us, acting *with us*—in so far as we accept his grace (what Prof. Daniel Williams calls the

whole of his love in action)—sometimes acting against us, whenever we will to thwart his will that in him we may be made whole.

And we are acting upon him, our powers sometimes resisting him, sometimes neutral toward him, sometimes uniting with his power. Because our God is sensitive, is he not by nature responsive to us? And if he is responsive he is affected by us, affected not to deviate one iota from his changelessness, but to open himself, so to speak, ever wider to us in our pitiful and tragic needs. Perhaps it is not too much to speak of Infinite Love as ever expanding, precisely because the church—the body of Christ—proves so imperfect.

We humans, gathered in the church, knit together in the body of Christ, meet God, learn of him, and affect him. In a sense we contribute to release of a greater abundance of grace given to make us more ready to stand before our Father, God, whose judgment of his church is absolute righteousness, whose justice is love, whose love embraces the church in creative interaction. I have said we contribute to release of God's grace; we do not *cause* it, perhaps we do not evoke it—for it is always there, a free gift—but we do *invoke* it. This we do when we are interacting creatively within the church—within the body whose head is Christ, within the community animated by the Holy Spirit wherein God continues to reveal himself to us.

God the Father comes to prophet and saint in their solitude; Christ is present in his body, the church; and the Holy Spirit meets the gathered company of human individuals in which his nurturing power is released. And until the gathered company actually experiences the enabling power of God's grace made manifest in the Holy Spirit, a church is less than the church; it is a collection of individuals. Just as the kinship family remains but a number of individuals, save as individualism is qualified by the mind and mood of the family unit, so the church fails to break through its institutionalized form except it become itself, a communion of saints wherein the individual is subject unto the brethren because they are caught up in the Lord. Again, even as a class is only an aggregation of individuals save as interaction, mutuality, and organic relations prevail, so is a church only an organization of disparate selves unless those selves become unified in love for one another and God.

Hence we conclude that prior to a church's being ready to nurture a novice in grace and knowledge of God, it must really be the church, the household of God in which people are no more strangers and foreigners but fellow citizens with the saints (Eph. 2:19). As theologically unre-

spectable as the Letter of James may be today in some circles, I take it that there is wisdom here; yea more, there is truth. For example: "Draw near to God and he will draw near to you" (James 4:8). The church as educator ought always to strive to lead its communicants into God's presence, and by any test of experience and insight I submit that entering into his presence will be seen as taking place in the measure that persons come to God through the fellowship, the church. Created for community, our complete growth is only afforded by means of Christian community.

In true community people hold all things in common: their creaturehood, their aspirations to be creative, their resources and interests. In fellowship persons regard each other with concern. Both the joy and the sorrow of anyone are joy and sorrow of all. Rest and labor, triumph and defeat, grace and sin, love and enmity in one affect all. In other words, the life of each is the life of the fellowship, when the fellows are united in Christ. The household of God is the family of God, and if we are in Christ we are new creatures, by his grace enabled to transcend our partial selves and restore the defaced fellowship that marks the church which fails to be Christian community.

How does this community come into being? And by what miracle might any given church that you may now have in mind truly rise above pettiness, pride, complacency, foolishness, enmity, and strife? Perhaps it is not very helpful to reply that a church becomes a Christian fellowship when God's gift of himself, in grace and love, is accepted. Nor are we satisfied by the reminder that his gift of his church will be appropriated by us only as we elect to receive it. Rather, let us understand that we are called upon to expend worshipful and intelligent effort to bring the fellowship into fullness of being.

Paul reminds us that he plants, Apollos waters, and God gives the increase. Nevertheless, planting and sustaining are inseparable from growth; and the work of God in creating and ultimately bringing the Christian fellowship to fruition is accomplished in and through us. It is not that God neatly divides his task from ours and tells us, "Do this bit, then stand aside and I'll carry on." It is, rather, that we are to know ourselves joined with him in the process of actualizing the fellowship that is ours provisionally. God provides it; with him we must bring it into full being. Verily, a church that is a church, a fellowship that is in Christ, is not handed to us or thrust upon us by the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Ours is the responsibility for learning to live in fellowship. This learning entails a lifelong educational process.

III

Just as a child's growth in the family ought to be preceded by rich learning on the part of the parents—the better for them and their children to grow along together—so older people in Christian fellowship are to grow in grace and knowledge as a sure means for readying the fellowship to assume its Christian vocation of nurturing babes in the Lord. It is out of the overflow of adult development that children are nourished in their initial stages. And later, as years and experience mount, it is out of the continuing relationship between young and old in Christian fellowship that individuals attain maturity in Christ.

Recall the educational principle that learning is living and living is learning. Although we do not necessarily learn by experience—witness the world's repeated resorting to war despite its futility for settling differences—it is only in and through experience that we can learn. To learn is to change. Considered change in conduct and value makes the difference between realization of one's gifts and powers and deterioration of the person and society. Adults can learn, do learn, thereby enlarging their worth not alone to themselves but to the human community.

Learning-theory and the grace of God must be considered together, at least when the problem of spiritual motivation is considered. A venerated teacher and colleague of other years denied this, maintaining that not grace but simple human decision motivates any kind of learning. But consider the most difficult of all learning tasks—that of learning to love an unlovable person. This, I think, is not accomplished simply by deciding to love him. Granted that one's decision may start the act of learning, and that a severely disciplined will gets the process well under way, I rather doubt that you and I, in and of ourselves, are able to complete this learning; for it involves such a thoroughgoing change in us, such an unreasonable and unnatural intent, that ordinarily we are powerless to carry it through. It is just here, I think, that the grace of God so empowers us that we are able to love the hitherto unlovable one. In one sense, grace is the motivation; in another sense, motivation—the power to see the learning task through to a conclusion—is a combination of one's own decision and the grace of God. Thus a task impossible for you or me, acting alone, becomes possible by God's acting in us. His gracious dispensation empowers us to learn to love, to be reconciled with persons toward whom we feel enmity.

Or take another illustration. Here is a person who elects to exercise

forbearance and kindness despite his proneness to quick irritation or harsh judgment. Business, home, and church relationships leave him enervated, if not depleted, and threaten to pull him over the brink into contentiousness; yet if he is renewed by grace, so that characteristically he practices forbearance and kindness, and the other fruits of the Spirit, he is growing into maturity in Christ. That this sort of growth occurs is testified to over and over, even by people who by temperament and habit are inclined to produce far more fruits of evil than fruits of righteousness.

Another educational principle holds that we learn that which we practice with satisfaction. Certainly the experience of grace affords the ultimate satisfaction, and to taste the achievement of having learned to be patient and kind and joyful and forgiving and loving, realizing that we are growing, is most rewarding.

A distinctly Christian principle of learning, then, is this: nurture in the faith depends on growth in grace, and the church is requisite for this growth. Now, as in New Testament times, Christians are to strive for growth in grace and knowledge of the Lord (II Peter 3:18). If we learn our lesson of grace, we live it not only in the church but also in the world; for example, in interracial relations.

Currently it is the United States Supreme Court that prompts a good deal of the tortuous advance toward interracial justice in America. But the Court is unequal to teaching people to love those on the other side of the color line; it cannot re-educate attitudes and refashion habits. Through the centuries we have heard with the hearing of the ear that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free; but only now, for us—in this land, in these fateful days—is this truth beginning to reach from the brain to the viscera, from the nervous system to facial and vocal muscles, from the mind to the act of physical association, so that we join with Negroes and other minorities among us and attain unto genuine oneness in Christ. The frank admission sometimes heard is entirely true: "In my mind I know all men are my brothers, but I can't *feel* it's so." That, I pause to add, is an example of incomplete learning because God's grace has not taken over. Being incomplete, it leaves a vast realm in which the Christian may strive for growth. But spiritual growth will not come about by simply relying on personal or corporate merit. All aspiring, all our intentions to be brotherly, all individual and collective goodness lack a dimension of love essential for learning brotherliness. How different the story when we recognize our limitations and turn to the grace of God, given in love to enable us to be loving!

Who among us can doubt that the church's most central task in this hour is that of fostering growth in grace? There are practical ways to proceed. Let me mention a few.

IV

Presently the uneasy conscience of an appreciable number of Christians makes them ready to probe more deeply the meaning and imperative of the gospel. A variety of fresh approaches to church education ought to be made in a spirit of "Come, let us reason together," and "Lord, what would you have me do?" Prof. John L. Casteel's *Spiritual Renewal Through Personal Groups* records the ventures of various adult groups in learning to live the gospel. In numbers of churches around the country, formal adult classes are being supplemented by study groups arising more or less spontaneously in quest of fuller understanding of the Bible and the meaning of Christian faith. One such group read and discussed among themselves Paul S. Minear's *Eyes of Faith* and D. M. Baillie's *God Was in Christ*. Only now and then was the minister's aid requested by these laymen whose spiritual hunger, interest, and intelligence motivate their explorations. Some informal church groups continue year after year, alternating biblical and doctrinal study with attention to child development and the nature of the Christian family, and not forgetting to enjoy recreation together; thereby personal friendship is deepened while men and women quicken the life of the churches.

Nor should we overlook the possibilities contained in existing organizations in the church—for instance in official boards—for growth in Christian grace. There are churches enlivened and enriched by boards which educate themselves by continuing study, thereby deepening personal and corporate faith. Instead of being enmeshed in routine functions, these organizations handle their business with dispatch and then address themselves to such issues as stewardship and the world mission of the church, thus subjecting the activities of the local church to the test of the Christian imperative.

An example of a denomination's approach to adult nurture is the Parish Life Conference used by the Episcopal Church. At its best the Conference weaves the principles and procedures of social psychology into the practice of Christian fellowship and demonstrates ways by which local churches may learn to be the church, a redeeming and nurturing community essential for both adult and child growth.

And who can miss the educative and redemptive power imbuing

persons when a major social and spiritual problem is met and handled lovingly and sacrificially, as in Montgomery under the leadership of Martin Luther King? One may say that to the extent that churches welcome present opportunities to resolve racial and other staggering problems in a spirit of brotherliness, they are realizing their maximum growth in Christ. This is how we learn to live by the grace of God. The Christian community, the church as educator, is the medium by which its communicants discover that they can learn Christian truth as they live it.

V

Foundational to our educational work is theology, an expression of what experience with God means to the Christian community. It is the church that nurtures persons in grace and knowledge of Christ, thus increasing love of God and neighbor. When adult nurture is vital, the fellowship is providing an atmosphere conducive to productive nurture of children. Dissatisfaction with the nature and accomplishments of religious education suggests the need for a more incisive education wherein learners at all ages enter into a continuing experience with God. This experience may be known simply as church education.

Is Ecumenical Curriculum Possible?

IRIS V. CULLY

IN RECENT YEARS there has been a falling away of interdenominational co-operation in practical matters of religious education. This is unfortunate, because such activities have made possible areas of religious experience that otherwise might have been left vacant. Weekday work, vacation church school classes, and community teacher training classes have been rich experiences for the participants, allowing people of differing backgrounds to learn together. The united educational work in missions has focused attention dramatically on a different area of the world each year, such as the Middle East or Africa, providing study books, pictures and filmstrips to enrich teaching.

One reason for decreasing co-operation is the growing denominational interest in each area, with a corresponding desire to promote a specific program and point of view. It is true that particular concerns need to be met if education is to be effective. The vacation school curriculum should have some correlation with the Sunday courses of study. Children need to learn not only about the mission to India or Africa, but also about the work which their denomination is doing. Teachers need not only methods of teaching, but also a knowledge of how to use a specific curriculum week by week. These requirements do not completely preclude continued joint efforts, but they do give a specific focus to the efforts.

Another reason for decreasing co-operation is the growing emphasis on theological and biblical interpretation within each denominational curriculum. This is a concern that must be met seriously by those who are responsible for interdenominationally used materials.

One might begin by noting that there seems to be a difference between the "interdenominational" and the "ecumenical" approaches, with popularity today moving in the direction of the latter. A seminary student highlighted this by deprecating the interdenominational attitude as "least-common-denominator," while lauding the ecumenical approach for making

IRIS V. CULLY, A.M., B.D., Ph.D., is Visiting Instructor in Religious Education and Director of the Curriculum Laboratory at Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois. She is author of *The Dynamics of Christian Education* (Westminster Press, 1958) and *Children in the Church* (Westminster Press, May, 1960).

each person conscious of the unique witness of his own denomination to the total Christian community. However correct or incorrect this distinction may be technically, it is widespread. The student seemingly was unconscious of the fact that the interseminary movement, which he enthusiastically hailed as a channel of ecumenicity, is sponsored by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., so often considered the epitome of "interdenominationalism."

Not every agency within the orbit of interdenominational life has felt the impact of this "ecumenical" approach, and the least-common-denominator aspect of co-operative curriculum materials is one source of the declining enthusiasm of many recently trained ministers and directors of religious education.

THE VACATION CHURCH SCHOOL

This is seen when communities begin to plan the use of vacation church school materials. One might take for illustration the material written on the theme "Jesus," since Christology is pivotal in an understanding of the Christian faith. Four textbooks were written in this area for use during 1958. An examination of these books indicates an excellent variety in activities and imaginative general planning. The format is attractive. Pupils and teachers would enjoy the sessions suggested. The materials also indicate certain theological presuppositions concerning the subject that would make a number of co-operating denominations unhappy.

Kindergarten and primary courses emphasize the friendliness and kindness of Jesus, with the corollary that he teaches us to be friendly and kind, following his example. This is summed up in a verse from the kindergarten book, *Children Learn from Jesus*, by Bernice E. Lyon:¹

Jesus teaches us to know
That kind and loving we must grow,
He teaches us to work and play,
And be more helpful every day.

So far, so good. Lovingkindness is a part of Christian life and witness, following both the example and the commandment of the Lord. However, in this material child and teacher miss completely the wonder of God's loving purpose shown in the coming of Jesus Christ. The lessons fail to indicate that Christian action derives from a relationship between the believer and Christ. This could be shown more clearly if the emphasis lay not on having the child identify with Jesus, in order to be helpful

¹ St. Louis: The Bethany Press. published for the Co-operative Publication Association, 1957, p. 15.

as he was and as he taught, but through having stories so written that the child identifies with those whom Jesus helped, and thus might be drawn to love him and to see God in him.

Courses for juniors and junior highs make more effort to come to grips with Christology. The purpose of the junior course, *Jesus Is His Name*, by Ethel Tilley,² is stated:

... to present so vivid and winning a picture of the story of Jesus Christ as it is given to us in the gospels that each junior will feel that he has responded personally to the invitation of Philip, "come and see,"—and that the wonder of what he sees will make its own impact upon his life. In other words, the child's living will not be a carrying out of the teachings of Jesus but a response to him.

This purpose is carried out in the approach to story-telling and the use of dramatics. That sort of jump, however, raises the question as to whether Jesus can be the example of helpfulness to kindergarten children and the Lord and Savior to juniors. Is he unique, and is his task distinctive, or should we imitate the little boy of Nazareth? Is this really progressive knowledge of him from his human to his divine nature, or will unlearning and relearning be required in order that the child may realize that the two natures are in one person? Christianity always has a problem, walking between unitarianism and tritheism, and religious education seems to bear the burden.

An examination of recent denominational publications concerning the purposes and theological bases for curriculum could give assurance to those who must plan and write for interdenominational use. The Methodist report, *Educational Principles in the Curriculum*, under the heading "The Christian Teaching about Jesus Christ" states: "Jesus is more than a teacher to be followed and more than an example to be imitated. He is Saviour and Lord, and the proper response to him is that of trustful acceptance and understanding obedience."³ This was written in 1952; a new statement, due from the presses soon, is unlikely to change the statement.

A guide for the new curriculum of the United Church of Christ, published in 1957,⁴ states: "The aim of Christian education is to nurture all persons within the fellowship of the church so that they are enabled to perceive and accept the proffered love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. . . ."

² Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, published for the Co-operative Publication Association, 1957, p. 12.

³ General Board of Education, The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee, p. 17.

⁴ *A Statement of Educational Principles as Seen in the Light of Christian Theology and Beliefs*. Board of Christian Education of the Evangelical and Reformed Church and the Division of Christian Education of the Board of Home Missions of the Congregational and Christian Churches, 1957.

The American Baptist guide, *Growing Up into Christ*,⁵ affirms: "The great objective of Christian education is the new person in Jesus Christ. All the materials and methods of Christian education, therefore . . . should lead to the growth which comes in a life surrendered to Jesus Christ."

These three statements are chosen because they come from denominations which have been loyal to the work of the Co-operative Publication Association wherever possible. The new statement of objectives for Christian education published in *The Objectives of Christian Education: A Study Document*, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.,⁶ is strongly oriented toward a biblical theology with an emphasis on relationships more than on rules. It says:

The supreme purpose of Christian education is to enable persons to become aware of the seeking love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, and to respond in faith to this love in ways that will help them to grow as children of God, live in accordance with the will of God, and sustain a vital relationship to the Christian community.

An analysis of the vacation church school series for 1959 on the theme "God" shows an emphasis on the creative and providential work of God. This is good, as far as it goes; but the Christian does not see the creative work of God apart from God's redemptive work. If the continuing work of God is shown to children exclusively in terms of creation, there is danger of suggesting a kind of "nature" religion that would be a far cry from the biblical emphasis on God's saving work in history and through persons. The climax of Genesis 1 is the creation of man. The Psalms praise God for the world through which he provides for the needs of his creatures. Compartmentalization of the understanding of God can be confusing when one would like children to see the wholeness of the gospel. The 1960 emphasis on the church attempts to show the child that the church is a fellowship, rather than a building, but does not fully appreciate the fact that the church is God's work and God's doing, into which man is called by the Holy Spirit. Again, however, the junior and especially the junior high courses give the child a deeper awareness.

WEEKDAY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The weekday church school texts, also published co-operatively, seem to be based on similar presuppositions. These are group-graded on a

⁵ Division of Christian Publications, The American Baptist Publication Society, n.d., p. 2.

⁶ 475 Riverside Drive, New York 27, New York.

two-year basis, in series which revolve around specific themes. Here one notices particularly that the writers evidence little familiarity with current biblical studies. The reading book for grades one and two, *Boys and Girls of the Bible*,⁷ indicates the friendliness and helpfulness of these children. The reader, however, will not see the mighty acts of God, who saved Joseph, called Samuel, and made himself (as well as the little boy with the loaves and fishes) known in the feeding of the multitude. There is, in general, too little awareness of the Bible as "holy history," and a paucity of knowledge derived from contemporary form criticism. An eleventh-twelfth grade course refers to the Fourth Gospel as a "spiritual" gospel, with no awareness of the growing interest in that writing as a specific historical tradition. But a 1959 high school course, *The Story of the Hebrew People*, by Merrill Beem,⁸ has an excellent outline of the biblical motifs.

Another series emphasizes various aspects of citizenship, but fails to probe deeply into the relationship of the person as Christian and as citizen. Is being a Christian citizen a step beyond being a *good* citizen? Jeremiah was not considered much of a citizen, and Jesus was crucified for alleged insurrection. The sharpness of Christian commitment is blurred here, as it is likewise in courses on the church.

The choice of negative comments is made in order to illustrate the problems involved in interdenominational curriculum. Many courses and parts of courses do contain excellent material. One's concern arises over the basic understandings from which these themes are approached.

In regard to the weekday curriculum, however, it must be further pointed out that while the materials are attractively printed as examples of religious books, they cannot bear comparison with the books that the children leave in the schoolrooms when they go to weekday church school classes. The only weekday courses similar to school texts are those published by the United Lutheran Church on a closely-graded basis, with hard-covered reading books for children, semester workbooks, and a special teacher's book into which the pupil's material is bound.

The solution here is not easily stated. Released time, in so far as Protestants are concerned, seems to require united action. To have children attend their own churches for the last school period on a specific day (as happens in some cities) is simply to continue the Sunday church-school pattern. Is it too much to ask a serious facing of contemporary theological

⁷ By Myrtle A. McDaniel. Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, published for the Co-operative Publication Association, 1957.

⁸ New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, published for the Co-operative Publication Association, 1959.

and biblical trends by interdenominational committees, editors, and writers?

MISSIONARY EDUCATION

A third area of interdenominational education action is in the field of missionary education. The imprint of the Commission on Missionary Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. is "Friendship Press." The word "Friendship" in the title is significant. It comes from an era of emphasis on "world friendship" and a soft-pedaling of the proclamation of the gospel. Today the missionary task is seen as the total mission of the church, and an effort is being made in these texts to see missions in terms of the task of proclaiming the good news of God's action in Christ.

This was particularly difficult with regard to the 1958-59 theme, the Middle East, since evangelistic activity has been banned in Moslem countries, and the kind of work indicated for the church in these areas has been a perplexing problem to all communions. Yet the books managed to show the people who have proclaimed the gospel, even unto death. The children's books included several reprints from an earlier cycle, the objective being to acquaint children with the kind of relationships that can take place between Christians and Moslems. The accompanying teachers' guides, however, did not probe the problems facing the Christian mission in those areas. It may be that there is a tendency to underestimate the capacity of at least the older children to understand such questions.

"Africa," the 1959-60 theme, came at an opportune moment. Users of the material have been particularly impressed by the way in which awakening nationalisms in Africa were made clear; the reading books, even when they began with the traditional tribal life, showed also the developing life in the cities. The film on Africa was especially good because it was narrated almost entirely by Africans, and one sensed that the church in Africa is a sister within the world Christian Church.

The several "methods" books published in the field of missionary education reflect the changing theological currents. Edith Welker's *Friends with All the World* suggests by its title the "friendship approach" for children; Louise Griffiths' *Wide as the World* emphasizes the use of projects for junior highs; and D. Campbell Wyckoff's *In One Spirit*⁹ suggests a theological orientation for work with young people, beginning with the thesis that the work of the church is to proclaim the good news

⁹ All three books from New York: Friendship Press, 1958.

of Jesus Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. These books point toward the need to wrestle with the meaning of missions for children's work. Do children need to begin with world friendship and progress to the awareness that God has given us a great Gift, whom he commands us to share with all the world? Is it possible to be aware, from the start, that the Christian is "different," and still be friends with non-Christians?

IN CONCLUSION

Only passing reference is made to interdenominational co-operation in leadership training. The national teaching mission is using new techniques that can enlarge the scope of this work. The increasing use of denominational training programs, notably the laboratory schools of the Methodists and the "preview courses" of the United Presbyterians, have cut deeply into many community leadership training schools. Unquestionably the Co-operative Series books, even when newly written, are dull in format compared with the appealing and inexpensive booklets put out by the separate denominations. The emphasis on methods (always necessary due to the constant teacher turnover) leaves a feeling that the teachers are learning *how* to keep a class interested, but have nothing of depth with which to challenge each child. Some leadership training schools observe that enrollments in "content" courses increase while those in "methods" courses decrease. Perhaps children's work courses should put more stress on using the Bible with children, teaching children to pray, and understanding the Christian faith.

One may draw several conclusions from a study of interdenominational curriculum materials. The materials for young people show a response to more recent theological trends and approaches to biblical understanding. Older children are given the opportunity to become "involved" in their understanding of biblical events in such a way that they are faced with the responsibility for making decisions. They are beginning to understand what it means to witness to the gospel in word and action.

There is an urgent need to consider seriously some basic understandings of Christian theology in the writing of children's curriculum. Specifically, one might ask questions such as the following. How is the relationship between God and Christ made clear in the teaching of children in such a manner as to produce no contradiction between the kindergarten picture and that given to the junior child? What is the basis for Christian conduct? Is it the word of Christ, the example of Christ, a relationship to him, a

response to him? How does one choose the "slant" for biblical stories? Let us be realistic here: any retelling of a story reveals a point of view by its word choice, its emphasis, as well as the particular section of biblical narrative chosen for the retelling.

One hopes for constructive answers to these questions in terms of the curriculum writing for projected series. Such constructive re-evaluation will begin with the presuppositions of the curriculum, the aims for each area of study, and the understanding of how these aims can be carried into the writing for each age group.

Returning to vacation church school materials, we note that the United Presbyterians have had their own courses for some time. The American Baptists are using the interdenominational theme but writing their own materials. The United Lutherans have their own courses. So have the Episcopalians (for methodological as well as theological reasons). One solution would be to accept these differences and co-operate only in general terms, using joint publicity and agreeing that all vacation schools would be held at the same time in a given community, but in separate churches, using denominational materials. Another alternative might be for the National Council of Churches to issue only the theme for the year and the general outlines, permitting the separate denominations to develop these as they wished. This would make possible joint publicity and teacher training. There is a third possibility: rethinking the biblical and theological emphases for the teaching of children.

Something will have to happen soon. Many ministers and directors are eager for a different orientation in curriculum, particularly in the children's materials. The possibility of such a change is hinted in the National Council's recent study outline, *The Objectives of Christian Education*. To some extent, it begins to be reflected in some of the actual writing for children's courses. Meanwhile denominations continue to strengthen and promote separate programs. If that trend continues, it would be most unfortunate. The same writers use their skills for several editors, adapting to points of view as required. There is genuine value in co-operative efforts which enable children to go to their neighborhood church to work and worship with the same friends they know in school.

There really is such a thing as "ecumenical theology." If the persons who write it across denominational lines can meet with one another through the study groups of the World Council of Churches, surely those who write children's curriculum materials within this one country should also be able to "meet" likewise.

Let us Not Forget the Mighty William Ames

DOUGLAS HORTON

IN THE NEW EDITION of Williston Walker's *A History of the Christian Church*, revised by Cyril Richardson, Wilhelm Pauck, and Robert Handy, occur the following sentences:

In these same years [the very early 17th century], a new Puritan position was shaped by Henry Jacob (1563-1624), who had been a member of Robinson's congregation in Leyden, William Ames (1576-1633), prominent theologian exiled to Holland, and William Bradshaw (1571-1618), leading Puritan writer. These men enunciated the Independent, or non-separatist Congregational position, from which modern Congregationalism has directly stemmed.¹

These words are significant because, in the first place, they tell the story of the Church in New England as responsible historians today have come to understand it, remedying the defects of the nineteenth-century interpretation shared even by Williston Walker himself: the main stream of New English ecclesiastical life is here shown to derive not from men like Robert Browne, who were willing to stand for freedom outside the rest of the church and were generally known as Separatists, but from men of the kind named, who stood equally for freedom, but wanted it inside the larger church. It is this attitude of the ancestors which alone accounts for the co-operative turn of mind and the unflagging interest in ecumenicity which has been evident in their descendants.

In the second place, and for our purposes more importantly, the passage mentions William Ames (whose name does not occur anywhere on the original pages of Williston Walker) as one of the artificers of American Puritanism. He was indeed the first great thinker of the movement. His books were still being recommended in the early years of the eighteenth century, though he had died a hundred years before. When Increase Mather, the sixth president of Harvard College, preached the ordination

¹ Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959, p. 409.

DOUGLAS HORTON, B.D., LL.D., Litt.D., L.H.D., is the former Dean and John Lord O'Brien Professor of Divinity, Emeritus, of Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. The substance of this article was given as a lecture before the Congregational Historical Society in 1959.

sermon of Nathaniel Appleton in Cambridge in 1717, Ames's *Marrow of Sacred Divinity* was the only book of dogmatics he suggested for the young minister's reading.

THE EARLY YEARS

William Ames was born in England in the year 1576. Elizabeth had been on the throne for eighteen years and was to remain there for twenty-nine more. William's father, a merchant of Ipswich, the capital of Suffolk County, and his mother, the daughter of a well-known family of the community, were sufficiently blessed with this world's goods to permit him to look forward to a decent education. But his education began long before he went off to the University. He was early influenced by the devout manner of life typical of the Puritan kind of family into which he was born. He undoubtedly attended not only the Sunday services in the church but also the weekday lectures by which Puritans were trying to re-establish an informed and vital Christianity within an established church which they felt had become at some points superstitious, at others hollow. He was a pupil in the Latin School of the city. Even when he was suddenly orphaned of both parents, he was able in the family of an uncle to continue this kind of training at home and at school.

It was almost inevitable that he should have chosen Cambridge rather than Oxford for his university, for that was the center for Puritans. There he would find, in especial, the richly endowed (of head and heart) William Perkins. Fuller said of Perkins' sermons that they "were in their simplicity even to the most educated still admirable and in their learnedness still understandable for the most simple." Perkins was at Christ College, and it was to Christ College that young Ames went in 1582. In his fifty-fourth year, looking back on his college days, Ames mentioned Perkins alone among all those in whose lecture rooms he had sat:

I gladly call to minde the time, when being yong, I heard, worthy Master PERKINS, so Preach in a great Assembly of Students, that he instructed them soundly in the Truth, stirred them up effectually to seeke after Godlinesse, made them fit for the kingdome of God; and by his owne example shewed them, what things they should chiefly intend, that they might promote true Religion, in the power of it, unto Gods glory, and others salvation.²

But young Ames proved to be made of sterner stuff even than his master Perkins, who always gave sufficient conformity to the norms of the church authorities to be allowed to remain in England. Although Ames was obviously a man of scholarly promise, it quickly became evident that his

² Ames, W., *Conscience, With the Power and Cases Thereof*, 1643, preface.

Puritanical leanings would shut him out of both the teaching and the parish ministry. As he emerged into a position of recognized leadership, imprisonment seemed imminent, and he escaped with Robert Parker from Gravesend in a fishing boat owned by one Richard Brown, one of the Puritan brethren, and landed in Rotterdam about the year 1610.

THE POLITY OF THE CHURCH

Ames settled for a while at Leyden—a matter of special moment for New England, for it was here that he was able to confer at length with John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrims. The latter, as will be remembered, had left England an out-and-out Separatist, but now Ames, aided by Parker and by Henry Jacob of Millenary Petition fame, was able to argue him back toward a nonseparating position. I say *toward*, for he came only part way. He did, however, as his later writings show, cease to be a rigid Separatist, and conceded that the Church of England was not wholly without the marks of a true church, and that there were probably many of the saved who were members of it. "I did," he says, "remit and lose my former resolution: and did, to speak as the truth is, forget some of my former grounds." He at least went back to the halfway mark—far enough to be known as a "Semist." And when the Pilgrim Fathers were ready to sail, they were able to assure the authorities in England that they acknowledged "saving fayth in thousands in ye land (conformistes & reformistes) . . . wth whom also as wth our bretheren wee do desyer to keepe speritaull communion. . . ." Such a statement as this would never have been made by Separatists of the authentic kidney.

When from 1629 on, colonists began to pour into Massachusetts Bay in numbers vastly greater than those of the pioneers at Plymouth, they fixed the Congregational pattern for the centuries to come, for they were almost all of one mind on the matter of polity (I say *almost* and not *all*, because there were Presbyterians at Newburyport), and that mind was that of William Ames. It is noticeable that in such writings as John Norton's *Answer*, which in 1648 set forth the way of life of the New English churches, though a score or more authorities are cited, the name of Ames leads all the rest. Ames made the congregation the center and soul of the life of the total church on the ground that there alone corporate worship could take place. His strong aversion to any ecclesiastical system which permitted an invasion of a congregation, living an orderly life according to the biblical pattern, by an outside force from the side either of the state or of the church was not because of any democratic notion, but because the company of

worshippers gathered around Christ was for him the most precious thing in human existence: it *was* the church of God himself at that particular spot and therefore sacrosanct. That this congregation was a democracy so far as the relation of the people to each other was concerned was incidental to its being first of all a monarchy whose sole head was Christ. Ames defines the church as "a company of believers, a company of those who are in Christ, a company of those who have communion with Christ." "Is a Beleever bound to joyne himselfe to some certaine particular Church? Yes, by all meanes. For if we would approach to God, we must joyne our selves to that Society, where God is in a singular manner present, so that he may be found of those that seeke him."³

But Congregationalism, as Ames understood it, is not a collection of little Christian groups outside of any whole. The fellowship of Christ implies a whole, of which the various congregations are parts, since Christ is one. "A particular Church in respect of the catholick Church which hath the respect of an whole, is a member compounded of divers severall members gathered together, and so in respect of those members it is also an whole."⁴ There are two wholes: the whole of the local church, of which the members are parts, and whose wholeness cannot with impunity be broken into from outside; and the whole of the great Church of Christ of which the various congregations are the parts. Membership of an individual in the one insures his membership in the other: "Those who are . . . believers by profession, so long as they remaine in that society [the particular church] are members of that Church, as also of the Catholick Church as touching the outward state."⁵

Here you have the persistent Congregational pattern, called by some of its early defenders *the middle way* because it ran neither into the ditch of Separatism (which is freedom apart from the fellowship) on the one hand, nor into that of authoritarianism (which is the fellowship denying freedom) on the other. Ames is one of those whom Christendom today can thank for this balanced conception.

Congregationalism in this twentieth century in both Britain and America has developed a new application of Ames's principle that a body of people assembled to worship God as he reveals himself in Christ is a congregation with power over itself though without power over any other. This is the idea that a church council is such a congregation. In a meeting

³ *Ibid.*, 4.24.1-2.

⁴ *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, 1642, 1.32.5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.32.11.

of an Association or a Conference or a Synod or an Assembly, all the marks of a true Christian congregation are to be found: for by whatever name it is called it is a group of faithful people covenanted together to worship and walk as Christ wills that they should. John Norton said that a true church congregation can be made up only of those who are directly called from the world, and that a council, since it is made up of people who are only indirectly so called, being already members of churches, is not of the nature of a church. Ames would probably have agreed with him, for he seems to have seconded Bradshaw in his declaration "that every Company, Congregation, or Assembly of men, ordinarily joyning together in the true worship of God, is a true *visible Church* of Christ, and that the same title is improperly attributed to any other convocations, Synods, Societies, combinations, or Assemblies whatsoever."⁶

These men probably never conceived that there would be a council which did not have or claim authority over the churches from which its delegates came; but it is from Ames that the great positive definition of a church comes—a body of people covenanted to worship God—upon which theologically the modern council rests, outmoding Norton's negative considerations, and making modern Congregationalism not a rope of sand but a free and flexible, united and effective instrument for the hands of Christ.

PREDESTINATION

From Leyden Ames went on to the Hague, whither he had been invited by Horatius Vere, an influential Puritan, and where he became the chaplain-minister of the English army and colony. There he married his predecessor's daughter but she, alas, died not long after.

Here Ames found himself in the midst of controversies regarding predestination and its companion doctrines. From 1603 to 1609 Dr. Arminius had been the theological professor at the University of Leyden. Though he was personally a man of most irenic spirit, his suggestion that man had some part in determining whether he would be saved or damned, and that Christ died for all men and not for the elect alone, threw the strict Calvinists into such theological hostility that a dispute arose which pervaded all classes of society. In 1616 and 1617 Ames contributed books to the debate on the side of traditional Calvinism, and not long after, his *Coronis* summed up the arguments on this side so strongly that his Dutch colleagues hailed him as an angel of light. The Arminians, or Remonstrants, as they came to be called, described him otherwise.

⁶ Bradshaw, William, *English Puritanism*, 1605, 2:1.

It all came to a head in the famous Synod of Dort in the winter of 1618-19. Thither came delegates from many Reformed countries round about, even from England; and Ames, having just lost his pastorate in the Hague, thanks to the long arm of the non-Puritan bishops in England, became a consultant to the Moderator of the Synod at a salary of four guilders a day.

Herein lies one of the precious ironies of recent Congregational history. The Remonstrants of today, who are the lineal spiritual descendants of the followers of Arminius put on trial at Dort, are now good and regular members of the International Congregational Council, of which the spiritual descendants of William Ames are also members. What has happened? A milder mood has come over all theological controversy, making most schools more understanding of each other than they were yesterday. Both groups have changed in the course of the centuries—even to the extent of permitting Professor Calhoun of Yale, good Congregationalist, to observe in an *obiter dictum* that the thought of Arminius on predestination is probably the sanest and most satisfactory of that entire period. The issue which divided the fathers in those times is now regarded as intellectually unresolvable except in the form of a dialectic whose members, though opposites, can neither of them be affirmed without affirming the other. Though the absolute sovereignty of God and the absolute liberty of man contradict each other by the ordinary laws of logic, most Christian thinkers are now willing to say that both are facts, and that the intellectual difficulty arises only because we attempt to apply our conceptualizing mind, designed to handle material things, to God and the self, which are not material things. The divine sovereignty and human liberty may be hostile to each other in logic but they are not so in experience, and so we hold to both. Ames and Arminius shake hands.

THE PRACTICAL EMPHASIS

At the close of the Synod of Dort, the question for Ames was how he was to keep body and soul together. There was some hope that he might be called to a chair of Christian Ethics at Leyden, and the churches did not cease recommending him for it—did not cease, that is, until the voice of authority from the Church of England again made itself heard, and the appointment seemed politically inadvisable. During this period his protectors took care of him in an interesting way: Ames became a kind of tutor to the sons of certain Amsterdam families studying at Leyden, and by them was paid for his work. It was for these young men that he wrote his *magnum opus*, the *Medulla Theologica* (translated *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*).

Now he was called to a professorate in Franeker, in Friesland to the north. Again the English authorities tried to stand in his way. Carleton, the English ambassador, while professing friendship actually wrote letters to influential Dutchmen with the intent of putting a roadblock between Ames's appointment and his installation, and almost succeeded. When in 1622 Ames arrived at Franeker, he was not allowed to lecture. But here Edward Harwood, an Englishman of substance living in The Netherlands, being ready to be counted the friend of so promising a thinker, secured his position for him through Prince Maurice. At Franeker Ames continued his studies in the controversial points of Calvinism, did his exegetical work in the Psalms and the Epistles of Peter, wrote his thesis against Rome, *Bellarmino Dissected*, and, most important of all, completed his second well-known work, *Conscience*.

Here should be noted a fundamental characteristic of Ames's thought—a characteristic which he drew from Puritanism, refined, and bequeathed to the modern Church. This was his emphasis on *living* the Christian life. The first sentence of the *Medulla* is: "*Theologia est doctrina Deo vivendi*" (Theology is the teaching of living to God). No other theologian of his day began his theology in such a way. By way of contrast, Calvin had opened his *Institutes* by treating of the knowledge of God and of ourselves; and this emphasis on knowledge, not duly balanced by other life elements, has bedeviled theology in many eras. Ames however saw clearly that contact with God implied a rhythmic life of right doing as well as right thinking, the two being reciprocating parts of right living. The Puritans are often pilloried by the ignorant for making much of morals at the expense of humanity, but their great leaders like Ames took a quite different viewpoint. Ames spent a whole chapter in the *Medulla* showing the intimate connection of faith and love. "In its nature it [love] follows faith as an effect follows the cause. Faith doth shew forth and exercise its efficacy in the stirring up of charity."⁷ Ames was suspicious of theology as pure theory. He would have appreciated the Arab saying, "If I want a glass of wine I do not go to the glassblowers." It is the practical content of theology which he made important to early New England.

Ames was not slow to reproach others who seemed to think that religion had little to do with morality. One of the reasons he could not accept the theology of one of his colleagues was because the latter every now and then would apparently relieve the academic tedium by going off on a most tremendous binge. The students, knowing this man's gift for imbibing,

⁷ Marrow, 2.7.30-3.

would sometimes give him a chance to exercise his talent to the full, and then, under the pretext of carrying him home, deposit him at the gates of some remote village whence he would not have time to return for his next lecture. Ames insisted on decent living as a part of the life of a theologian, and of theological students. His addresses to students during this time are slanted in this direction. In the one entitled *Christo et Ecclesiae*, the motto of the University in Franeker, which was to become, perhaps thanks to its use in that very address, the motto of Harvard, he gives a picture of student life which we do not ordinarily associate with church schools. There was need for a dash of Puritanism.

THE EMPHASIS ON FAITH

Another quality of his thinking to which modern religious thought owes more than it is wont to acknowledge is Ames's basing of his system on the fact of human faith. His contemporaries in general picked up the traditional teachings of the past about God, his omnipotence, his Fatherhood, his wisdom, and the like, and created their systems out of those conceptions. Faith could then be defined as an acceptance of these doctrines. Not so was it with Ames. He begins by defining faith as "a resting of the heart on God, as on the author of life and eternall salvation." What could be more modern? The good counselor today does not try to cram a conception of God into the head of the man who comes to him for spiritual aid: he tries to get him to see that the very fact he has come to him for counsel at all argues a kind of faith: he would not seek Christ, as Pascal intimated, unless he had already somehow found him. He tries to get the man to rest upon whatever faith he has, if it is only faith in the form of a question, since even the question about God separates him from mere animality.

When finally Ames comes in his argument to a description of God he frankly says: "God as he is in himselfe cannot be apprehended of any, but himselfe. As he hath revealed himselfe unto us, he is conceived as it were, by the backe parts, not by the Face."⁸ But a personal relation can be established: this bond of faith, weak as it may be at the beginning, permits a growing knowledge of God. As we develop our union with him in Christ, our theological conceptions become clearer. Faith, according to Ames, is not primarily in doctrines: it is in God, the Person who meets us as persons.

It was this idea that produced Pietism in Europe. The only German book on Ames (by Karl Reuter) is entitled *William Ames: The Leading Theologian of Awakening Reformed Pietism*. This is one of the most im-

⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.4.3.

portant movements Europe has seen in its later centuries: out of it came Bible study, better liturgical practices, hymnology, religious poetry, philanthropic institutions of all kinds, foreign missions, and, above all, the theologian, Schleiermacher, to whom today modern scientific theology is indebted beyond measure. And it is noteworthy that Schleiermacher begins his theology precisely as Ames does—with a look at the human being. Out of the sense of dependence he finds in man he builds his whole theology. So also Paul Tillich begins with the human situation. Ames may almost be called the fountainhead of this stream of thinking in modern times.

REQUIESCAT IN PACE

In December, 1630, Ames wrote to John Winthrop that he intended to follow him to New England at the first opportunity. Ames was an Englishman and, what is more, his second wife was very much an Englishwoman who longed for her kind. On the same grounds that motivated the Pilgrim Fathers the two were willing to leave a Holland which, on the whole, had been very good to them.

But Ames was not to reach New England. He went to Rotterdam, where he associated himself as co-minister with Hugh Peter in a rapidly growing church. There his intention was to found a school, but that was not to be, either. He caught cold in a flood that washed into the basement floor of the house he lived in, and in a little he found himself with a raging fever too violent for his weakened heart. He died in October, 1633.

His wife presently came to New England, settling at Salem.

His library came also, being taken to Harvard.

His influence came too—and that is to be found wherever free minds unite for worship.

Religion and the Arts

Albert Camus' Quest for Ethical Values

ROBERT H. BRYANT

CAMUS' RECENT TRAGIC DEATH in an automobile accident stunned admirers and foes alike. Those who had followed his career closely feel a profound loss, realizing they will hear no more from one of the most honest and incisive observers of our time. Even Jean-Paul Sartre, with whom Camus quarreled, has expressed regret that his fellow countryman should have been cut off so absurdly in the middle of life.¹ Camus was writing a novel and several other major works at the time he died. It is interesting to speculate how his thought might have moved in these, but more important probably to try to see in proper perspective the contribution this latest of the great French moralists had already made to the present generation's self-understanding.

Camus won fame chiefly as a keenly perceptive novelist and essayist. He was never really interested in philosophizing in the more restricted technical sense. Yet he read and reacted more or less critically to some leading nineteenth- and twentieth-century philosophers—Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Husserl, Heidegger and Sartre. Moreover, he took as his main task finding a meaning in his own and other human beings' existence in this chaotic age, and this led him to seek a metaphysics and ethics through introspection much in the manner of St. Augustine and Pascal.

Since so much of Camus' writing emerged from an intensely personal struggle, it can hardly be understood without knowing something about the main turning points in his life.

I

His childhood years were times of mingled contrasts. Born of an impoverished working-class family in Algiers, his earliest and most poignant memories were of his nearly stone-deaf mother's silent suffering and of

¹ Sartre, Jean-Paul, "Tribute to Albert Camus," *The Reporter*, February 4, 1960, p. 34.

ROBERT H. BRYANT, B.D., Ph.D., who formerly taught at Vanderbilt University School of Religion and Mount Holyoke College, is now associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Religion and Philosophy, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky.

care-free, suntanned companions on the North African beach. These youthful associations largely account for both the realistic sensitivity to human misfortune and the affirmative, hopeful outlook which remained characteristic of Camus' writing.²

The first real crisis in his life was a severe attack of tuberculosis when he was seventeen. The prolonged illness following made him fully aware of what it is to be human—to battle for a meaningful existence amidst unpredictable and seemingly contradictory circumstances. Physically unable to withstand the long arduous study necessary for a doctorate and advanced teaching position, he settled for a career as journalist and writer. Fortunately at the University of Algiers he became a student and friend of the philosopher Jean Grenier. Grenier instilled in him a deep appreciation for Greek tragic literature, Plato and Plotinus. Under Grenier, Camus wrote a thesis on Plotinus' influence on St. Augustine.

In Algiers Camus did not win quick public recognition, but he did form a close circle of friends who encouraged his efforts as writer and drama producer. In the early 1930's, like many other young intellectuals, Camus expressed pacifist leanings, opposition to Fascism and concern for the underprivileged, by joining the Communist party. After only a couple of years he became disillusioned with Communist methods of promoting social reform among the Arabs and broke with them.

Some dismiss Camus as only another "pessimistic" French writer. This shows thorough ignorance of his books, however, and overlooks the fact already indicated that his earliest and deepest roots were not European-French but Algerian. He first visited France when he was twenty-three, after traveling as a poor student throughout southern and central Europe.³ On this sojourn sunny Italy appealed to him more than France and the rest of the gloomy continent. In 1939 he settled in Paris and, except for several short periods, stayed there throughout the Nazi occupation as a secret leader in the French resistance movement and editor of its newspaper, *Combat*. During these war years several of his better-known works—*The Stranger* (1942), *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1943), and two plays, *The Misunderstanding* and *Caligula* (1945)—were published.

At the war's end many Frenchmen, including Sartre, deeply admired Camus for his heroic resistance leadership and literary achievements, but not until 1947—on publication of *The Plague*—was he widely acclaimed France's most talented post-war writer.

² Brée, Germaine, *Camus* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1959).

³ Hanna, Thomas, *The Thought and Art of Albert Camus* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1958), p. xiv.

The years following the war were not happy for Camus. After the Nazi threat passed, political differences with former comrades of the resistance became more sharply evident; he alienated others by opposing Communists who tried to exploit the French domestic situation for their own ends; and finally he suffered another severe tubercular attack. All these trying situations increased his feeling of isolation and drove him toward more rigorous self-examination. Between 1951 and 1956 he produced no markedly significant work.⁴ But in 1956 appeared his somewhat ambiguous and highly provocative novel, *The Fall*,⁵ and a year later *Exile and the Kingdom*, a short-story collection. In 1957 Camus received the Nobel prize. This distinction simply confirmed his growing international reputation and one critic's conviction that he was the writer who best held in tension all the "contradictions and longings" of our post-war period.⁶

II

Camus is often identified with the existentialists. In a very broad sense this label may be justified: one does find in him somewhat the same antipathy for detached metaphysical systems, the same stress upon the individual's almost intolerable freedom and responsibility in an absurd world as in Sartre or other contemporary existentialists.⁷ Camus, though, explicitly repudiated the label "existentialist" and tried to dissociate himself from Sartre. In an interview right after the War he commented, "The only book concerned with ideas that I have published, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, was directed against the so-called existentialist philosophers."⁸ Camus sometimes employed existentialist terminology, but only in seeking to delineate a few simple childhood images which for him best expressed the incomprehensible human situation.⁹

One does well to follow Germaine Brée, who discerningly characterizes Camus as a "moralist in the tradition of the great French moralists of the seventeenth century."¹⁰ Camus supported this characterization in a recent preface: "I have tried as best I could to be a man with an ethic, and that is what cost me most."¹¹

⁴ Brée, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-57.

⁵ Cp. Thody, Philip, *Albert Camus, A Study of His Work* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957), p. 75 ff.

⁶ Hanna, *op. cit.*, p. xix; cp. Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁷ Cp. Camus, Albert, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955), p. 28 ff. for Camus' discussion and evaluation of the existentialists.

⁸ Delpech, Jeanine, *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, no. 954, 15 novembre 1945.

⁹ Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 205; Hanna, *op. cit.*, p. xvi.

¹¹ Camus, *L'Envers et l'endroit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1957), preface; quoted in Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

He preferred to develop his ethical insights not in the systematized, logical manner of the professional philosopher but in a more intuitive, metaphorical, even pictorial fashion. One of the most impressive features of his writing was his descriptive power—an ability to portray in the finest, most suggestive detail the distinctive character of persons and situations. This is very evident, for example, in *The Stranger* and *The Plague*. There the description more than gives a superbly vivid physical impression of Meursault or Dr. Rieux; it leads one into their innermost feelings and struggles.

Camus was above all the artist. He remarked autobiographically, "A man's work is nothing but the long journeying to recover, through the detours of art, the two or three simple and great images which first gained access to his heart."¹² Camus' choice of these initial images was personal and, at first glance, a bit arbitrary. Once asked to list his ten favorite words, he replied: "The world, suffering, the earth, the mother, men, the desert, honor, misery, summer, the sea."¹³ These symbols are all derived from his childhood experiences in Algeria—an unforgettable combination of poverty and joy in the beautiful North African landscape. These remained fundamental for him, because they seemed to strip away all the illusions of comfortable middle-class sophistication; they constantly made him aware of the paradoxical relation of misery and grandeur in his own and all human existence. Camus' writing attempts to use these basic symbols to express man's destiny in this world; on them all his implied ethical and metaphysical beliefs are founded.¹⁴

I should like now to examine the several stages through which Camus passed in his effort to build a mature moral outlook from deeply imbedded childhood images. These stages are instructive, because they sum up not merely the inner struggles of this one French writer but the search of many other twentieth-century persons for a viable set of values.

III

The first period in Camus' moral quest—childhood and adolescence—is best described as *passionate addiction to the physical world*, to life itself. His earliest experiences, as we have seen, were far from completely care-free. He learned firsthand in his family and working-class environment the tragic effects of poverty and affliction. Still these did not dominate his

¹² Camus, *L'Envers et l'endroit*, preface.

¹³ Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

¹⁴ Vigée, Claude, "Warrior in This Worldly Kingdom," *Saturday Review of Literature*, April 18, 1959, pp. 20-21.

consciousness, but rather a feeling of warmth, delight in the natural forces in himself and the surrounding world.¹⁵ He immersed himself in sports, especially swimming, and in gay night life.

Camus might have enjoyed his relatively carefree, sensuous existence much longer had not the severe attack of tuberculosis at seventeen rudely reminded him that suffering and death are inescapable ingredients of human existence. This close brush with death did not change his life outwardly as much as inwardly. After a short period of confinement, he recovered sufficiently to begin his studies at the University of Algiers. There he earned his way by odd jobs and devoted whatever time was left from study and work to sports. Reflecting later on his and fellow students' experience during this university period, he commented interestingly but with some exaggeration: "Our greatest occupation was—and for a long time remained . . . for me—athletics. It was on the playing fields that I learned my only lessons in moral ethics."¹⁶

But even if the outer life seemed much the same, the inner outlook was changing. In the fight against tuberculosis, Camus developed greater sensitivity to the suffering of fellow human beings; his interest in philosophy, literature and dramatic production developed quickly; and all the time he struggled against the nihilism of many of his contemporaries. From this nihilism he might have concluded that his own and all Western society's will-to-be was futile. Instead, his *Notebooks* during this early period already express repeatedly the intense concern for ethical values and yearning for a life esthetically and intellectually well grounded which have remained characteristic of him.¹⁷

Camus' decisive break with the first stage in his quest for ethical values—preoccupation chiefly with the sensuous—came in the early 1940's. By that time France's disillusioning collapse, grim underground service, a renewed siege with tuberculosis, and Nazi execution of a very close friend—all had thrown a gloom over his earlier hopefulness. He found he had to wrestle honestly and fully with the absurdity in his own and others' existence.

IV

This second phase of Camus' search for an ethic, the battle with and beyond the absurd, is well expressed in *The Stranger* and *The Myth of Sisyphus*. These were both published in 1942. *The Stranger* tries to produce

¹⁵ Maquet, Albert, *Albert Camus, the Invincible Summer* (New York: George Braziller, 1958), p. 15.

¹⁶ Letter quoted by P. Néraud de Boisdeffre in "Albert Camus ou l'expérience tragique," *Etudes*, December, 1950, pp. 303-304.

¹⁷ Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 21 ff.

the feeling of the absurd through the words of its hero, Meursault. *The Myth* explains the concept of the absurd or the rationale assumed in the novel.¹⁸

Meursault is an ordinary employee who goes through his daily, monotonous routine unfeelingly. Even the death of his mother whom he has not seen for years does not disturb him. The day after the funeral he has an affair with Marie, a pretty stenographer. To a proposal from Marie and an offer of a better job he responds as he does to everything else—with bored indifference. Then a series of unexpected and almost unexplainable events occur: Meursault favors a fellow-lodger Raymond, who turns out to be a shady character wanted by the police. In a gun duel on a beach, Meursault, blinded by the sun, unintentionally kills an Arab. He is imprisoned, tried and sentenced to the guillotine “in the name of the French people.”¹⁹ Faced with inevitable death, Meursault violently assails a priest who comes to comfort him with talk of God and the after-life. He has no time or interest for such subjects but wishes only to be alone. In the last moments he takes satisfaction that most of his life has been fairly happy, and he is innocent of the “odious crimes” of which the prosecutor accused him; so he resolves for the first time to open his heart to the “benign indifference of the universe.”²⁰

In *The Myth of Sisyphus* Camus describes the “absurd” as arising when suddenly one finds himself alienated from the familiar world around him. One faces the daily routine with the question “why,” and finds no clear, rational answer, only weariness and meaninglessness. He beholds man’s inhumanity to man, recognizes himself caught up in time’s ravages, and finally faces death. From all these evidences of the absurd—the “confrontation between human needs and the unreasonable silence of the world”²¹—there is no escape, except perhaps suicide.

Camus feels here some kinship with the existential philosophers, especially Jaspers, Chestov and Kierkegaard. They have all dealt profoundly with the experience of absurdity, the contradiction between man’s expectations and the actual world, as well as the anxiety accompanying this experience. Yet all the existentialists try to find a “rational” or “religious” escape from the absurd; hence they deny the contradiction by conceptualizing and deifying it. Theirs is a philosophical suicide.²²

¹⁸ Maquet, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

¹⁹ Camus, *The Stranger*, translated by Stuart Gilbert (New York: Vintage Books, 1954), p. 135.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²¹ Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*, p. 28.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

The true alternative is neither philosophical nor physical suicide. Both go too far in passively resigning to the absurd, accepting it as ultimate and limitless. The problem of the absurd is inescapable; still man need not despair. As long as he is human, he is conscious of life and freedom. He is free to *revolt* against death and the gods, if there are any. Revolt or passionate affirmation of life in face of inevitable death "gives life its value. . . . To a man devoid of blinders, there is no finer sight than that of the intelligence at grips with a reality that transcends it. The sight of human pride is unequalled."²³ Conscious of mortality, one's hope lies neither in the eternal beyond nor in complete rational comprehension but in life's great possibilities—within limits—here and now. "If I admit my freedom has no meaning except in relation to its limited fare, then I must say that what counts is not the best living but the most."²⁴ Qualitative judgments of better and worse must be discarded in favor of quantitative appraisals. What counts is realizing to the fullest the experience of each given moment. Camus' ethics at this second stage becomes a heroic or Stoic hedonism.²⁵ Sisyphus, the hero of the absurd, by defying the gods, yet recognizing and accepting his situation in the world as it is, becomes his own master. He finds joy and freedom in knowing that the universe can no longer deceive him. There is no situation, however wretched, which his scorn cannot overcome.²⁶

The idea of the absurd so brilliantly expressed in *The Myth of Sisyphus* did not satisfy Camus very long. In an essay, *Remark on Revolt*, written two years later (1945), he indicated its inadequacy as an ethical principle at two points. First, it is too egocentric. "In the absurd experience the tragedy is individual"; one tends to overlook that "he shares this estranged condition with all men," and that humanity everywhere suffers from the contradiction between itself and the world.²⁷ Second, the hero of the absurd goes too far in attempting to exclude judgments of value entirely and living merely quantitatively or enjoying each present moment to the fullest. One cannot exclude value judgments entirely, Camus states, because "they are bound to the very fact of existing."²⁸ The absurd must be abandoned, therefore, for a more positive and inclusive concept—revolt.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 60 ff.

²⁵ Brée, *op. cit.*, pp. 199, 203.

²⁶ *The Myth of Sisyphus*, p. 123.

²⁷ Camus, "Remarque sur la révolte," *L'Existence*, ed. by Jean Grenier (Paris: Gallimard, 1947), pp. 11-12.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 35 f.

V

Revolt is the notion central to the third stage of Camus' ethical quest. He defines it as the "impulse that drives an individual to the defense of a dignity common to all men."²⁹ It involves a "yes" as well as a "no." In rejecting the oppressor's claim to absolute power and being willing to die for his conviction, one not only affirms a value in his own relatively free existence but others' also. Revolt is more than an intellectual concept; it is an incentive and program for action. The rebel, like the hero of the absurd, rejects belief in an eternal being on whom he can depend; yet he moves beyond the often self-defeating anxiety of absurd experience in assuming he can do something constructive: he can struggle to enhance his own and society's welfare. Any one who rejects the responsibility of revolting against power that destroys human solidarity denies his own nature. In such circumstances man must revolt to be at all.

Camus hammered out his concept of revolt between 1945 and 1951 against the sordid realities of Nazism and Communism. He regarded both of these as perverted forms of revolt. The Nazis, claiming to defend human liberties, admitted no limit to their power to dominate and exploit; the Marxists, likewise, by confusing their ideal of the classless society with justice, established another terrible type of political terrorism.

Preferring always to dramatize his convictions rather than merely to discuss them abstractly, Camus vividly expressed the notion of revolt in *The Plague*, a novel (1947), and *The State of Siege*, a play (1948).

The Plague is frequently regarded as Camus' finest work and the most important French novel to emerge from the World-War-II period.³⁰ Much of it was written during the German occupation of France and expresses indirectly the gloom and sense of isolation the French then felt. Symbolically, however, it portrays the revulsion felt in every age against physical evil and men's unnecessary cruelty to each other.

The novel records day-by-day events in the Algerian city Oran while its inhabitants are subjected to bubonic plague and cut off from the external world. Camus slowly and skillfully leads the reader to feel and identify himself with the people's intense emotion. Dr. Rieux, the narrator, describes the rats' arrival. First only a few appear here and there; then they soon lie bloody and dead almost everywhere in the houses and on the streets. The people, frightened and dying *en masse*, try to find a meaning in their

²⁹ Camus, *The Rebel*, translated by Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage Books, 1957), p. 18.

³⁰ Hanna, *op. cit.*, p. 148 f.

terrible affliction. This questioning centers in Dr. Rieux, the physician leading the battle against the pestilence. Father Paneloux in a sermon offers the traditional theological explanation that the plague is God's way of punishing the city's dwellers for their sin.³¹ But Paneloux speaks as a scholar who has had little direct contact with the dying. Later he and Rieux watch while a child dies painfully of the disease. Rieux, turning on the priest, protests against a world in which innocent children are tortured. Throughout the remainder of the book Rieux impatiently rejects any explanation that minimizes the gross injustice the plague-stricken city has suffered. The only satisfactory answer he finds is that in this world without God suffering may teach one compassion and solidarity with others.

The theme of revolt is continued in the play, *The State of Siege*. Here again the story is about a city suffering from disease. But the plague is not, as in the novel, the broader problem of natural and moral evil with which men forever wrestle; it is a particular type of political order—the totalitarian state. The plague is a dictator who rules the city by threat of death, who prides himself on having abolished “anarchic” freedom and substituted for it “order, silence, and absolute justice.”³² This totalitarian regime begins to fall apart when Diego sees that the dictator's divide-and-conquer policy succeeds only because of each person's cowardly indifference to his fellow citizens. Bitter experience has made the city-dwellers fully aware, however, of the dangers in either unrestricted freedom or absolute regulation; they revolt for a society in which there will be limits on the human ego, guarding it against moving self-deceptively toward either extreme.

This concept of revolt as involving limits or tension between freedom and order (expressed at the end of *The State of Siege*) shows Camus' movement toward a more realistic and constructive approach to moral and social problems than in *The Rebel* or *The Myth of Sisyphus*.

The question where his thought on these problems was finally tending is difficult to answer, largely because of his recent, perplexing book, *The Fall*.

VI

The Fall has been much discussed, and most interpreters agree that in writing it Camus' outlook underwent a decisive change; but there are widely differing opinions about what the change was. Germaine Brée characterizes Jean-Baptiste Clamence, the “penitential judge” and hero of the narrative, as representing a “certain aspect of postwar Europe, the postwar Europe

³¹ Camus, *The Plague*, translated by Stuart Gilbert (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), p. 86 ff.

³² Camus, *L'Etat de Siège* (Paris: Gallimard, 1948), p. 95 ff.

of the erstwhile humanitarians, morally shaken, guilt-ridden, and in search of dubious self-justification."³³ Other writers understand the book as extremely ironical, one in which Camus enjoys playing with his reader, using the mask of Clamence to expose self-deception first in himself, then in the reader.³⁴ Still another view is that *The Fall* is Camus admitting how utterly inadequate his earlier humanism was and expressing the "full realization of sin and unworthiness which precedes the coming of Grace" and, perhaps, conversion to the Roman Catholic Church.³⁵ Supporting this last interpretation is Camus' frequent use of Christian symbolism: the name Jean-Baptiste, the concentric canals (corresponding to circles of hell), the doves (traditional symbols of the Holy Spirit) lingering over the fog, reference to the waters near Amsterdam as an "immense holy-water font," the descent of purifying snow, etc. Might it not be, though, that Camus' employment of these images is only a further example of his irony? He seems to dwell on them only to show how meaningless they are to this generation.³⁶ It is significant, too, that although Clamence recognizes that he and all men are slaves to self-love, this awareness does not result in his genuine repentance, only in hopeless resignation. Clamence's final words are: "But let's not worry! It's too late now. It will always be too late. Fortunately!"³⁷ Here is full perception of man's endless capacity for self-deception. Camus offers an almost Augustinian analysis of human depravity without Augustine's promise of divine grace.

What bearing does this have on his thinking? It is probably too much to assume that Camus had abandoned his humanistic ethics. *The Call* and other recent writings³⁸ do indicate, nonetheless, his increased awareness that Nazi concentration camps, Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt and similar experiences have shattered the possibility of building an ethic while presupposing essential human innocence or perfectibility. One must, he contends, face realistically human hypocrisy and cruelty, admitting how limited one often is in doing anything to alter them. Yet as artist, philosopher or ordinary citizen, we must not let realism degenerate into nihilism. It is necessary somehow to live creatively in this desert and express relevantly the simplest, most important virtues—honesty, courage, compassion.

³³ Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

³⁴ Hanna, *op. cit.*, p. 166. Cf. Mueller, W. R., *The Prophetic Voice in Modern Fiction* (New York: Association Press, 1959), p. 81.

³⁵ Thody, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

³⁶ Camus, *The Fall*, translated by Justin O'Brien (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), pp. 73, 128.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

³⁸ Cf. esp. his newspaper articles and editorials, some of which have been reprinted in *Actuelles I* and *II* (Paris: Gallimard, 1950 and 1953). See also Brée, *op. cit.*, p. 50 f.; Thody, *op. cit.*, p. 119 f.

The Fourth Gospel as Drama

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

IS THIS BOOK a drama, a sort of pageant? Act one, scene one: The Word comes down from heaven. The great constant is the Word. He speaks, he acts, and the other characters in the drama *react*. The author moves them onto the stage. They say their lines, make the great confession or the great denial, and then the author moves them off, to focus upon the next character or set of characters who will stand before the Constant, speak or be silenced, and in turn be removed. Scene after scene builds up to the confession: "Lord, I believe." With each scene the author is forcing his readers into a position of choice. He, the reader, must see or not see, confess or deny. He, the reader, like the author, must confess. For the author speaks directly to his reader over the heads of his characters. Often they are made to use words quite out of keeping, the author's own words.

One does not need to deny that Nathanael was instantly drawn to Jesus, and instantly left all to follow him, to doubt that this humble fisherman would in the first moment of encounter have had the theological intuition to exclaim, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!" An exclamation that may have been the fruit of a lifetime of thought and experience on the part of the author.

Martha, after the death of her brother, answers Jesus' "Do you believe?" with "Yes, Lord; I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, he who is coming into the world." Here the author is quoting himself in the prologue. The homebody who busied herself in the kitchen (according to the Synoptics) would surely have left the dishes to join her sister at Jesus' feet, if she had thought him the Christ, the Son of God. In the very next sentence Martha is once more in character, as she rushes home to Mary and tells her quietly, "*The Teacher* is here and is calling for you."

Seeing the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, the Pharisees cry in alarm, "The world has gone after him."

In Gethsemane, when the soldiers come to take Jesus, twice he asks

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE of Evanston, Illinois, is a poet and writer of meditations well known to readers of *The Christian Century* and other periodicals. She has in recent years undertaken New Testament studies at Garrett Biblical Institute.

them, "Whom do you seek?" Twice they answer, "Jesus of Nazareth." And when he makes the great proclamation, "I am he," they draw back and fall to the ground. This is theological drama.

There are other instances in the book that illustrate the same type of thing. Notably the climax at the close of chapter 20. One character has to be out of the room during the first scene, so he can doubt and then be convinced in scene two. The author has drawn us emotionally to this scene through twenty chapters. Now he is ready for the ultimate disclosure. With the cry of Thomas, "My Lord and my God!" we have reached the throne of heavenly grace. Nothing further is reported about Thomas. He has said his lines. Presumably he has sunk to his knees—and we with him.

Is this book meant to be drama or history? One thing is certain: the author, whoever he was, fairly reels under the impact of an experience. The only adequate analogy is Paul's experience on the road to Damascus. Whether he knew Jesus in the flesh or not, our author certainly *knew Jesus*. This book is no compilation of earlier sources, no hearsay material, the fruit of no orderly research, like Luke's deliberate, scholarly addressing himself to the problem at hand. This book is a shout, a cry: "Thou art the Christ!" If it was written in his old age by a contemporary who had known Jesus in the flesh, there is certainly nothing feeble or senile about it. The dynamics of the book are tremendous.

The author lived so deeply in Christ, so intensely in the present, that perhaps he lost all sense of ordinary time and was writing proleptically. "Now is the judgment . . . I have overcome the world." And perhaps some of the sayings that seem misplaced in the context really were uttered by the characters indicated, but uttered *later*. After Lazarus had been raised from the dead, Martha may well have said to Jesus, "You are the Son of God."

Not when they saw their enemy riding by on a donkey at the head of a crowd waving branches, but on the day of Pentecost, perhaps, when the disciples preached in tongues to the Jews of the Diaspora, *then* the Pharisees might have said to one another in dismay, "You see that you can do nothing; look, the world has gone after him."

If there is a lack of eschatological emphasis in this Gospel, may it not be because the present is so ever-present to the author? Not that, embarrassed, he was trying to show how it was that the last days were delayed, but that to him there were no first and no last days, only today. Only the day he knew Jesus and received life through him. Life that was one long participle: the light that was *coming* into the world.

Commentary

Protestants and Catholics in the United States

TO THE EDITOR OF RELIGION IN LIFE:

Since the end of the second World War a dialogue of increasing intensity is taking place between Roman Catholics and Protestants in Europe. It is not due in the first place to the ecumenical movement, towards which Rome has adopted an attitude of great reservation from the beginning. Though Rome no longer calls Protestant Christians "heretics" but designates them as "our separated brethren," the Vatican insists, as it is bound to do, that the dogma of the Church which comprises the authority and infallibility of the Pope must be unconditionally accepted and that any negotiated union on the basis of a doctrinal compromise is out of the question.

The desire that Roman Catholicism and the various Protestant denominations should gain more mutual understanding than they have had in the past has been felt particularly in those countries which include both faiths, i.e., not in mostly Catholic Italy or in almost completely Protestant Sweden but in countries like Germany and Switzerland. France has not many Protestants but the Huguenots were once numerous, and the present French Protestant community is influential and highly respected though small.

One might conjecture that in the United States with its strong Catholic minority the desire for an interdenominational encounter should be as strong as in Germany or Switzerland. That has, however, as yet not been the case; and there are several reasons for this relative lack of interest. One reason is that in this country Protestants and Catholics are not as a rule separated geographically. None of our states is as Protestant as the Swiss Canton of Geneva or as Catholic as Southern Bavaria. Another reason is that America has been spared religious wars. Germany has had many such bloody conflicts and so has Switzerland, where the last civil war over the religious issue took place as late as 1847. The religious communities in the United States are fortunate in that they have known fewer or no conflicts they must wish to forget.

In their search for a new solidarity European Christians have been strengthened by the terrible experience of the war years. Those years demonstrated that the common faith in Christ was more important than all the confessional labels. It was understood that there is no abyss that divides

the true Christians but that an abyss really divides the entire community of all the faithful from the powerful non-Christian world. The result was the new dialogue between Protestants and Catholics; and subsequently there emerged an ever-growing collaboration in the fields of biblical theology and exegetical scholarship, ecclesiology, and community lay work.

Indications of a similar movement have recently appeared in the United States. The chances of a dialogue between Protestants and Catholics have been discussed in books and articles; and the Spring issue of *RELIGION IN LIFE* is dedicated to this very subject.¹ Something, however, is missing in this otherwise excellent survey of the chances of future solidarity between Protestants and Catholics. Nothing is said about the difference between the American and the western European scene. None of the contributors has dealt with this difference and consequently none has posed the question whether the co-operation among the scholars of both faiths which we are witnessing in Europe can be expected to materialize in America as well. Another question worth investigating is whether lay movements of the European variety hold a promise in this country.

Regarding the first question: The work on the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which Americans have taken a very active part, has demonstrated that Catholics and Protestants can work very well together. But in the fields of theology and biblical exegesis the situation is not in America what it is in Europe. American Protestantism from its very beginning has been evangelical; it has had little room for or appreciation of theological scholarship. It is therefore unlikely that co-operation in these fields will amount to much in this country.

More practical and pragmatic means will have to be devised. It is here that the question of a lay renaissance arises. Why are there no Protestant lay movements in America comparable to those in Western Europe? There are several answers to this question. Americans have as yet not fully recognized that they are living in a dechristianized society. They are apt to equate the "American way of life" with the "Christian way of life." The growing numbers in church membership and church attendance make them ignore the basically un-Christian character of their society, which has lost its narrow denominational outlook only through secular indifference.

All the European lay centers have certain ideas in common which have as yet not taken root in America. The members of all the various groups are

¹ A recent European publication of great significance bears the title *Begegnung der Christen, Studien evangelischer und katholischer Theologen*, Frankfurt a/M., 1959. The editors of this book of nearly 700 pages are the Protestant theologian, Professor Oscar Cullmann, and the Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Einsiedeln, Maximilian Roesle, O.S.B..

fully aware that there exists a nearly complete separation between the religious community and the world at large. In order to bridge this gap the Church, so they feel, has to become once more a missionary Church in the realm of the world. This can only be achieved by carrying the secular relevance of the gospel into man's daily life. In the words of a member of the Iona community: "We have to carry the roof of the church over all the building of man's daily life"—because on account of Jesus Christ the world should not be left to its own profanity.

Members of these lay groups could all be called revolutionary. They are *avant-garde* from the religious point of view. Through their work and by their complete lack of sectarianism they further Catholic-Protestant encounters. How far similar Protestant lay groups could function in this country is difficult to say. The present so-called religious revival will not facilitate their work.

There exists, however, in this country one lay Catholic group which in many ways is unique both in its ecumenical and in its Franciscan spirit. Reference is to the Catholic Worker group which resembles both in spirit and through its work of practical Christianity some of the European Protestant lay experimental groups. It was founded with much faith and very little money by Dorothy Day, its present head, and Peter Maurin, a Frenchman. During the height of the depression in May, 1935, they launched their first House of Hospitality and their publication, *The Catholic Worker*. Peter Maurin died some years ago, but Dorothy Day is carrying on and has become so widely known in America that some time ago *The New Yorker* published one of its profiles about her. Her group has about ten Houses of Hospitality throughout the country. The Catholic Worker group takes in any person who asks for shelter or food and gives him not only a roof over his head and food for his stomach but also love and warmth. Dorothy Day and her followers are devoted practicing Catholics. They also are militant pacifists and practice nonresistance like the Quakers.

Though American Catholics are mostly middle-class in outlook, this group which by all counts is revolutionary in spirit has flourished and grown. Others may yet fall in with this originally Catholic venture and attempt to be Christians first and subsequently Protestants or Catholics.

MARIA FUERTH SULZBACH
New York City

Book Reviews and Notices

Basileia: Tribute to Walter Freytag. Edited by JAN HERMELINK and HANS JOCHEN MARGULL. Stuttgart, Germany: Evangelischer Missionsverlag, 1959. 519 pp. D.M. 19.80.

This massive volume is a tribute to a man and his ecumenical mission. It is a well-deserved tribute, for, though virtually unknown in this country outside missionary circles, Walter Freytag was not only the undisputed leader in German Protestant missions but also a distinguished and increasingly influential figure in the world Christian movement as a whole. He spoke quietly; but his intense words were weighted with wisdom and a luminous grasp of essentials, both temporal and eternal.

It is indicative of the pivotal position he had acquired in recent years that, besides being Professor of Missions and Ecumenical Relations at the University of Hamburg, he was chairman of the German Missionary Council, editor of the German ecumenical quarterly, *Oekumenische Rundschau*, a vice-president of the International Missionary Council, member of the Joint Committee of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, and chairman of the Division of Studies of the World Council of Churches. Numerous articles and reports, and notably his book, *The Spiritual Revolution in the East*, attest his penetrating understanding of the encounter of Christianity with the religions and cultures of the East, and of the theological problems of missions.

All these activities were but channels through which Freytag sought to communicate his dominant concern with "biblical realism" in the life and witness of the church. This was for him no academic theory; it was a matter of existential attitude. He became known as one of those uncomfortable voices that, in season and out, insisted on the eschatological character of the missionary task—as a witness "between the times" to a living Lord who is come yet is still to come. Out of this perspective, he also gained deeply felt convictions about the interdependence of mission and unity, which made him a persuasive protagonist of the integration of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches as a significant step forward.

BASILEIA—the victorious reign of God! The editors of this anniversary volume could hardly have found a more fitting title to characterize the consuming missionary passion of a man who was—if the term be permitted—an eschatological activist.

The celebration this coming August of the fiftieth anniversary of the Edinburgh Conference will no doubt produce many retrospective accounts of the dramatic changes which have occurred since then in the world missionary enterprise, and of the men and women who, by their vision and devotion and power of inspiration, have significantly contributed to its advance. Walter Freytag will be among those so remembered, and not among the delegates. The present symposium was published on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday in May, 1959. A few months later he suddenly passed away.

The publication of a *Festschrift* is a gracious way for colleagues and friends to honor a man of distinction in academic and ecclesiastical circles; it is a custom flourishing particularly in Germany. But the *Festschrift* is a literary genre difficult to review. Editors may propose but the contributors dispose, dependent upon their momentary interests and writing projects. The result is a motley bouquet of topics and articles

—some are brief fragments, others lengthy scholarly essays, very uneven in quality and significance; though in this case, on the whole, of high caliber.

The fifty-two contributors include missionaries and missiologists, churchmen and scholars from Britain, Ceylon, France, Germany, Holland, India, Scandinavia, and the United States. One finds many names of international renown: R. Pierce Beaver, P. D. Devanandan, Sir Kenneth Grubb, John A. Mackay, the Metropolitan James of Melita (now Greek-Orthodox Archbishop of America), Paul S. Minear, D. T. Niles, O. Frederick Nolde, Ronald K. Orchard, Eugene L. Smith, Henry P. Van Dusen, W. A. Visser 't Hooft, and Max A. C. Warren. Many of the essays are in German, the others in English, the ecumenical language of our time.

Precisely because of its diversity in subjects and authorship, the volume projects a captivating kaleidoscopic picture of surging ideas, of experiences and experiments on the ubiquitous frontiers of the gospel. The editors have conveniently grouped the essays under four heads which aptly describe Freytag's main fields of interest: Missions, Religion, The Church, and The Ecumenical Movement. Lacking space to discuss even the major essays individually, I shall instead take up some topics which reflect Freytag's own concerns and at the same time indicate points of creative thrust in the world Christian movement today—and tomorrow.

In a perceptive study Max Warren lists four emphases "in which Walter Freytag has spoken with prophetic voice to the missionary movement of our time." (1) Drawing on his own experiences both in Nazi Germany and in the mission field, Freytag never tired of underscoring the paramount importance of the *corporate* witness of the congregation. It is the witnessing community, both locally and on a world scale, which makes the gospel incarnate and articulate. (2) Only when the end of missions is seen in the perspective of the END, there emerges a full understanding of the demonic forces opposing it, its unbounded divine possibilities, and its tremendous urgency. (3) "'Our missionary task' is not to be treated as the whole of the Church's Mission, still less of the Mission of God." It is only a part of God's own missionary action toward the world. (4) Both as a scholar and a strategist, Freytag pleaded for a higher appreciation of the role of research in the missionary enterprise. For research, quotes Warren, "is the meeting point between our task and the factual situation of the man we have to reach with the Gospel."

The theme of the corporate witness of the Christian community appears in several papers on the articulation of the gospel in the community life of the younger churches (Georg F. Vicedom), the growing "house church" movement (Edwin H. Robertson), and the idea of the apostolate in the Dutch Reformed Church (Evert Jansen-Schoonhoven).

Freytag must have enjoyed R. Pierce Beaver's exploration of a little-known territory: the shifting forms and fortunes of eschatology in American missionary thought. Among other things, Beaver draws attention to what he calls "the earliest genuine instance of almost universal ecumenical action," the interdenominational Concert of Prayer for Missions, which originated in the middle of the eighteenth century. For a New Englander it is interesting to note that the abiding source of inspiration in that movement was a little book by Jonathan Edwards with the (for the times) brief title: *An Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union among God's People, in Extraordinary Prayer for the Revival of Religion, and the Advancement of Christ's Kingdom on Earth, Pursuant to Scripture Promises, and Prophecies concerning the Last Time.*

The manifestations of the Holy Spirit are the earnest of the coming kingdom. The longest essay in the collection, a careful outline of "An Inquiry into the Work of the Holy Spirit," is therefore in fact closely related to Freytag's eschatological emphasis; though the author, Eugene L. Smith, takes a different position and is primarily concerned with relating the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to the experience of contemporary psychotherapy, and the implications of that relationship for missions. He rightly terms "A re-study of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit . . . one of the most critical needs and fruitful opportunities of the Christian Church today." His paper is of particular interest to Methodists, not least for the reason that the World Methodist Council is focusing its next assembly in 1961 on this very subject.

While Winburn Thomas and O. G. Myklebust discuss the general problem of missions in the theological curriculum, Theodor Muller-Kruger's case study from Indonesia illustrates the enormous difficulties involved in developing an indigenous program of ministerial training which does not simply adopt or adapt Western patterns. H. H. Walz, the general secretary of the German Kirchentag, develops stimulating ideas about the need for a "lay theology of terrestrial realities" which would give direction to the church's movement into the world and help it to overcome the persistent dangers of espousing an escapist piety or succumbing to institutionalism and clericalism.

The last part is devoted to the *ecumenical* mission of the church. Edmund Schlink, one of the leading figures in continental Lutheranism, sets the separated Christian flocks in a larger unifying context: "They are all embraced by two mighty acts of God . . . whether they acknowledge it or not." For they come from the first Christ-event and they go forward to the second. The concluding essays by Victor E. W. Hayward, Ronald K. Orchard, and Henry P. Van Dusen discuss the imperative of unity in mission in more familiar Anglo-Saxon terms. They are a call to commitment; for the vision they project is still on the sky of the future. The everyday life of the churches is still pre-ecumenical. Yet today, as in the past, as Van Dusen reminds us, the Christian world mission remains the promising "precursor and progenitor" of the greater church to come.

The volume is adorned by a characteristic picture of Walter Freytag at his desk. It shows a transparent face, engraved with the exhaustions and worries of an overcrowded life, but shining with gentleness and spiritual power. The eyes see beyond.

NILS EHRENSTROM

Professor of Ecumenics, Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts.

Horizons of Christian Community. By PAUL S. MINEAR. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1959. 127 pp. \$2.75.

In this book, Professor Paul Minear of Yale Divinity School treats the problem of Christian community in terms of New Testament thought. All but one of the chapters was originally presented on the 1959 William Henry Hoover Lectureship in Christian Unity at the Disciples Divinity House, University of Chicago. They begin with the question, "Do we have an image of the church which is recognizably the same as that which is found in the New Testament?" (p. 10).

Dr. Minear, who has given a good deal of practical leadership to the newer emphasis upon the Church as a community of witness, presents here the Christian Community in terms of (1) *glory* to God and *unity* in service and mission (pp. 36,

56); (2) the *New Jerusalem*; (3) the *New Age*. The whole line of reasoning is, in keeping with the latest scholarship, heavily eschatological. In the whole chain of loyalty binding the church across the generations and languages, this-world and the other-world are no longer divided (p. 32). "Biblical typology . . . has a strong orientation toward the future" (p. 69). He offers evidence that in any understanding of the Christian future the understandings of futuristic eschatology, realized eschatology and fully existentialized eschatology must all be included (p. 87). The flat, two-dimensional emphasis upon the Simple Gospel of ethical values and prophetic insights—which slipped so easily into identification with culture-religion, whether *deutsches Christentum* or "the American way of life"—is no longer a part of the debate.

Most exciting to this reader were various points made in connection with the author's emphasis upon the New Testament understanding of the ministry of the laity (p. 115f.). The old idea that the church was an institution founded by the disciples for the perpetuation of Jesus' memory and teachings (Shirley Jackson Case) has lost its power, but in our American voluntaristic setting the idea of the Church as something to which we belong is still strong. And with it comes the depreciation of that membership to standards rarely better than those of any large and mixed assembly of fellow citizens. Dr. Minear shows that in biblical language Christians *belong* to Christ and *are* the Church (p. 110). He quotes de Zwaan on the meaning of "members": "All the gifts they possess and all the authority they display are a continuation of the work of Christ" (p. 112). In this context the whole question of membership reverts to its biblical dimensions of community and identity. The Church becomes again a living and disciplined community, with spiritual weapons and spiritual warfare (including the "weapon" of prayer, p. 51), in the world but not of it. Its basic commitments are given from One who is Judge as well as merciful Father. Its travel orders call for marching rather than permanent encampment. Its discipleship demands discipline rather than an amorphous and easygoing false freedom. The "freedom" of the Christian community becomes again what it has ever been to those called by the Name: obedience.

FRANKLIN H. LITTELL

Professor of Church History, Candler School of Theology, Emory University,
Atlanta, Georgia.

Jung and St. Paul. By DAVID COX. New York: Association Press, 1959. 357 pp. \$5.75.

Jung and the Problem of Evil. By H. L. PHILP. New York: Robert M. McBride Company, 1959. xiii-271 pp. \$4.95.

1. There are many defenders of the faith who like to think of Carl Jung as the champion of religion. Certainly his zeal is undeniable. In his hands the whole of psychology has been recast as a charting of man's quest for that reunion of opposites in the self which is a numinous or religious entity. Yet the zeal for religion may be misdirected if we forget Dean Inge's warning that religion is not necessarily a good thing. The unifying theme of biblical religion is, perhaps, a desire to expose the dangers of "domesticated" religion. The question becomes, then, what kind of religion does the Jungian view foster? Qualitative as well as quantitative judgments are necessary in assaying the religion of analytical psychology.

An interesting feature of this study is David Cox's use of rigorous logic and

linguistic analysis in clarifying both psychological and theological statements. His book focuses on the relation of Justification by Faith to Jung's therapeutic goal, Individuation. He is not content simply to locate the points of agreement and divergence between these concepts. He is ingenious in selecting models and frames of reference which lend themselves to a clarification of both. The analytic method reveals a surprising mass of contradictions even in our favorite authors, in the hands of one as competent as David Cox. Beyond its negative value, however, it opens a genuinely new method for the study and integration between the disciplines.

Cox believes that Jung's solutions are "complementary rather than contradictory" to Christianity. Since psychotherapy and Christian faith are the two systems in the Western world which hold out hope for changing human nature, a comparison of the ways by which change is accomplished should serve to sharpen and to point up their relevance for modern man. Hence both justification by faith and individuation refer to a *process* and to an *event*. Cox proceeds to an examination of each process in terms of its observable phenomena and internal meaning. A similar examination of the teleological event in each process follows. A comparison and contrast is, then, possible. Hence while penitence is the necessary condition for man's appropriation of God's grace, openness to the collective unconscious is required for an approach to the archetypal Self. The end result in each case, i.e., the justified sinner and the reunified Self, is a union of opposites. In both, consciousness is dethroned from its arbitrary role in the light of a more profound understanding of human motivation.

An underlying concern here is whether or not religion and psychotherapy can be equated. For Jung, "religions are all, as it were, special 'schools' of psychotherapy." But insofar as psychotherapy claims to be rooted in scientific methodology, it operates under the limit that its means do not yield revelation but the operational relation of one action or event to another. That religious illumination often accompanies psychotherapy cannot be denied. Its relation to other factors under technical control represents an unknown increment. Is it not necessary, however, to make the minimal distinction that whereas in psychotherapy a reasonable goal is a recovery of integrity *within* oneself, religion looks for the recovery of wholeness *beyond* oneself? The task of psychotherapy is to release the spirit of man so that freedom again represents a real alternative in his life. Religious faith is the means whereby man is enabled to cross over the threshold of anxiety in the active commitment of his freedom.

It is just here in regard to man's freedom that Cox's method of analysis tends to become formalistic and abstract. Penitence, for instance, is reduced to a state of having "no confidence in oneself." Its self-emptying passive aspects are emphasized. But penitence is also an awakening—to faith and freedom (see Alan Richardson, *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible*). *Metanoia* involves turning. It is a primary component of freedom. In like manner Cox tends to compare normative theological statements (such as those contained in the Thirty-Nine Articles) with the dynamic functioning of the therapeutic process. While it is one thing to believe that the efficacy of the sacraments are not affected by an unworthy priest, it is quite another thing to say that the person of the priest is not a factor in the reception of grace. Jung is not merely speaking psychologically when he says that the personality of the therapist is important in the healing process.

This book represents a significant development in the relation of theology to other disciplines. It demonstrates that a faithful application of logical analysis clears

the air. As a method, however, its very strength represents a weakness. In focusing on the clarity and logic of descriptive statements, it tends to ignore the meaning and the living embodiment which these words and sentences represent. It is not without significance that Cox by-passes the phenomena whereby psychoanalytic theory is constantly being revised in the light of psychotherapy. As a means of clarification and internal consistency this method of inquiry will commend itself to many students of theology. As an answer to the question, "Jung or St. Paul?" most will be grateful that in both their counsel includes intervening actions and commitments as well as explanations.

2. "Skeptics frequently complain," Dorothy Sayers once wrote, "that man has made God in his own image; they should in reason go further (as many of them do) and acknowledge that man has made all existence in his own image . . . he has no other yardstick." In his *Answer to Job*, Carl Jung was busily occupied in making over the traditional conception of the Godhead in the image of his patients' archetypes. Since many people refuse to recognize evil or sin in themselves, Jung suspects the doctrine of *privatio boni* (i.e., that evil is merely the absence of good) and he boldly prescribes that evil in the person of Satan be added to the Trinity, making it a Quaternity. H. L. Philp has gathered here, under the title, *Jung and the Problem of Evil*, his correspondence with Jung as well as an analysis and critique of the fundamental issues—the problem of evil (*privatio boni* particularly), Satan, and the nature of the Godhead. The result is a lively, somewhat repetitious defense of the traditional formulations.

It is Jung's conviction that out of the encounter and passionate discourse between Job and God there should come a *humanization* of God and a *divinization* of man. But the subsequent development of biblical religion has frustrated this outcome by overemphasizing goodness in the Godhead, which has resulted in the banishment of Satan to the limbo of the repressed. It must be emphasized that Jung is offering his observations from the perspective of the clinician and the layman. In effect, he is saying, "This is the picture of religion I encounter in my patients. From their point of view, the handling of evil in the traditional formularies is inadequate."

Without accepting his radical solution, I wonder if we must not take seriously Jung's charge that Christianity has undermined the practical reality and positive power of evil. Philp concedes that the conception of *privatio boni* has limitations in relation to a recognition of the force of satanic evil. The doctrine is most helpful, he maintains, in relation to the Christian assumptions about the nature of Godhead. God the Creator does not will evil. Its presence in the world represents the fall. Even so, I wonder if a recovery of the biblical modes and symbols with their inherent instinct for full-bodied existence is not a more adequate answer to the problem which Jung raises. For St. Paul as well as for the unsurpassed King James translators, there seemed to be no diminution of evil: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but . . . against powers, . . ." (Eph. 6:12).

Jung's critics maintain that the archetypes which he has encountered in practice are capable of adequate explanation in terms of purely individual thought rather than in the postulation of a collective unconscious. His chief failing, they say, is that he has not sufficiently "grasped the nature of the unconscious processes" in the *individual*. Like the restless wanderer in every age, he is off discovering new territory before the home base is sufficiently organized. The adequacy of these criticisms must be assayed by the experts. Meanwhile, the relevance of purely psychological

criticism of basic concepts in theology must be considered. While Jung constantly protests that he is offering empirical data, he is in fact judging the adequacy of received doctrine. Here it would seem that Whitehead's warning about "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness" is in order. Psychological abstractions by their very nature exclude other modes of knowing. It is dangerous, therefore, to make sweeping and general assertions without the discipline of holistic philosophy. But there can be no doubt that clinical observations such as Jung's offer the theologian and the philosopher both the occasion and the data for important "feedback" on his work. We are indebted to H. L. Philp for responding to this opportunity.

CHARLES R. STINETTE, JR.

Professor of Pastoral Theology and Associate Director of the Program in Religion and Psychiatry, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Christ and Freud. By ARTHUR GUIRDHAM. London: George Allen & Unwin (New York: The Macmillan Company), 1959. 193 pp. \$4.75.

Mystery on the Mountain. By THEODOR REIK. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. viii-210 pp. \$3.75.

1. Two recent works in the area of psychoanalysis and religion have in common a high degree of personal involvement on the part of their authors. Guirdham's *Christ and Freud* is at least the third in a series of psychoanalytic-biblical titles, others being Wellisch, *Isaac and Oedipus* (1954) and Cox, *Jung and St. Paul* (1959). Who knows what is next? Perhaps it will be *Adam and Adler*, or *Rank and Revelation*! As a matter of fact, Guirdham's title is somewhat misleading in that it leads one to anticipate a comparison of the teachings of Christ and Freud. There is a one-page evaluation of Freud, but no corresponding chapter on Christ. Rather than being a systematic treatise, this book is a first-person essay by a British psychiatrist on the role of religious factors in neurosis.

Guirdham rejects the notion of religion as an innate human need and likewise differs with Freud's oft-cited estimate of religion as a sign of man's emotional adolescence. Few would question his assertion that we should be concerned with religion for God's sake and not for our own. What he means by this, however, will give many readers pause: "When I say to count ourselves as nothing I mean this in its literal and not in any relative sense" (p. 24). Such talk of self-annihilation in order to realize a higher self is confusing and is associated with the very repressive sort of religion against which the author inveighs.

Beneath Dr. Guirdham's polished and witty aphorisms lies unmistakable hostility directed toward a variety of targets, the chief of which seem to be the National Health Service in Britain, evangelicalism, and the unpardonable sin, clericalism. As a result, his work is pessimistic and almost completely negative in tone and temper, which tends to antagonize the reader.

There are sweeping generalizations such as: "the incidence of neurosis in the Christian world is higher than in the less exclusive Buddhist and Hindu communities" (p. 22), and "all the great religions of the world, and for my purposes I refer especially to Christianity, Buddhism and the Hindu faiths, insist on the necessity of the individual seeking self-obliteration by absorption in God or the Absolute" (p. 16). In addition the author appears to assume that all sense of guilt is neurotic and therefore undesirable. The blame for the inculcation of this guilt he lays at the feet of Christian ecclesiastics.

His concluding chapter, "Priests and Doctors," contains a wistful but dubious hope that some day, providing civilization continues, we may achieve the conception of the doctor as priest or, better still, the priest as doctor. In this he shows no knowledge of the impact of the thirty-five-year-old clinical pastoral training movement in this country nor does he seem aware of the "comprehensive approach" in the philosophy of American medical care.

2. The second work, like the first, has a highly personal significance to its author. After forty-five years, Theodor Reik has turned again to explore seriously an interpretation of the Sinai-Exodus events which first occurred to him in 1913. *Mystery on the Mountain*, his latest work, presents a striking parallel to the "child" of Freud's old age, *Moses and Monotheism*, inasmuch as both books reflect a renewed interest on the part of their aging authors in Judeo-Christian backgrounds.

Reik begins with an acceptance of the Exodus narrative as an unfolding drama founded on historic events. Beneath this narrative, however, "as underneath the lines of a palimpsest," he sees the outline of a primitive Hebrew puberty rite. With "speculative audacity," as he puts it, Reik elaborates his novel hypothesis in the face of long-standing agreement by biblical scholars that there is no evidence in Scripture of such a ritual.

The strangeness of the author's assertions is tempered by an atmosphere of mellowness and transparent honesty. He is aware of the baffling problems which must be overcome in any attempt to reconstruct the Exodus story, and he presents his own attempt as "conjectural history." With almost a "nothing-up-the-sleeves" attitude he pulls out an interesting string of similarities between primitive puberty initiations such as those in Australia, New Guinea, and Africa, and the experience of the Hebrews. The initiates undergo a ritual death and resurrection; Israel wandered in the desert until a generation had died. Primitives eat sacred food; Israel ate manna. The Australian bull-roarer is the voice of deity; the *shofar* is the call of God. The medicine-man's mask represents deity; Moses' face shone with the reflected glory of God. And finally, primitive boys are taught the code of the tribe, after which circumcision admits them into the fraternity of men; Israel received the Decalogue and the circumcision was the token of covenant and confederacy.

Some skeptics may conclude that it was not a lack of moral courage that deterred Reik from following his early concept to its end so much as it was a lack of evidence. The unconvinced may even aver that this is what comes of listening too long with the "third ear"!

Dr. Reik anticipates many of the questions that will be raised regarding his method of "archeological psychoanalysis" as well as his conclusions. He never claims to have all knowledge or to understand all mysteries, but he has made a serious effort to come abreast of contemporary biblical scholarship, referring frequently to the work of Rowley, Engnell, Albright, B. W. Anderson, Eichrodt and others. His evident sincerity commends his work as worthy of an unbiased reading. He goes the second mile by avoiding the esoteric terminology which beclouds all too many psychoanalytic interpretations of religion. The stimulating originality of this work will establish it as a significant psychoanalytic contribution to the psychology of religion.

ALBERT L. MEIBURG.

Associate Director, Department of Pastoral Care, North Carolina Baptist Hospitals, Inc., Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Speculation in Pre-Christian Philosophy. By RICHARD KRONER. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. 251 pp. \$5.75.

Speculation and Revelation in the Age of Christian Philosophy. By RICHARD KRONER. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 269 pp. \$6.00.

These two volumes are the first two-thirds of Professor Kroner's three-volume work on the general theme of speculation and revelation in the history of philosophy. In the foreword of the second volume he informs us that the third volume dealing with the modern or Protestant period will soon appear. The total work will thus deal with the history of Western philosophy from a Protestant Christian viewpoint. Of the two volumes before us, the first deals with the ancient period, and the second with the development of a Christian, or as Kroner puts it, with a Roman Catholic philosophy from patristic times in the ancient world through the decline of the Middle Ages.

This work does not claim to be an altogether inclusive or comprehensive history of philosophy. Indeed the author is frankly selective in his choice and treatment of persons and ideas. For example, the sophistic movement in ancient Greece receives short shrift, and the Epicureans are not treated at all. The men and movements described are approached as illustrations and developments of the theme of speculation and revelation. Yet, as the reader finishes the last chapter of Volume Two, he is aware of how much of Western philosophy the author has organized around his theme. Perhaps this is because this theme is one which is not imposed upon Western philosophy but rises from the ideas and issues which are its substance. Surely Professor Kroner is convinced that this is the case, and he makes a very persuasive case for this position.

In two large acts (with a third to follow) the men and movements of Western philosophy move across Kroner's stage. In the first act we see speculation emerging from Greek myth in Thales and Anaximander, and continuing through such figures as Heraclitus and Parmenides to its climax in Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle (these three are presented in substantial detail), and to its conclusion in the Stoics. While Kroner's focus of interest is the relation of speculation to revelation (or proto-revelation in the case of the Greeks), he manages to get the man and his main ideas before us. The author does not present new or startling theories, but he does give us the distilled results of a lifetime of study and critical reflection. His judgments are as open and candid as they are blunt; and even when the reader questions or disagrees he will not fail to be stimulated by Kroner's views.

The second volume picks up the story with emergence of a Christian philosophy in the age immediately following the New Testament. Kroner sees a radical change of key in this new movement. Greek thought had been cosmocentric; Christian thought is theocentric. Greek thought had been largely esthetic in temper; Christian thought was ethical. Greek thought was impersonal; Christian thought was radically personal. The problems of God, of the relation of reason to faith, of human freedom and history emerged as crucial in the new period. These are but a few of the themes which dominated philosophy from Justin Martyr and Origen through Augustine, Anselm, Abelard, and Aquinas to Eckhart and Cusanus. In each case Kroner succeeds in illuminating both the man and the ideas he is expounding. There is an especially good chapter on the scholastic proofs for God.

The remark is made in the first volume that Western philosophy is a kind of great conversation concerning God, man and the world. The expositions of these volumes have the effect of engaging the reader in so personal a way that as he concludes

the book he feels that he has been drawn into conversation with Professor Kroner.

Dr. Kroner's book is as frank in its metaphysical viewpoint as in its Protestant Christianity. He believes in speculation unabashedly and unashamedly as that form of thinking which must seek "ultimate truth and reality," and he has few misgivings that the search will succeed. This claim is entered not so much for any particular philosophy as for the enterprise of philosophical speculation in the grand style of Plato and Aristotle, of Aquinas and Hegel. Such thinking has both an irreducibly personal nature and a rational or logical aspect. To deny either of these is to do violence to philosophy. In this day when philosophy's birthright has been sold for a mess of semantic pottage it is stimulating to see a philosopher in the grand, traditional manner going about his business without logical hindrances or inhibitions.

Yet if Kroner will be attacked from the philosophic "left" as a metaphysician, so too he will be attacked from the theological "right" by those students of biblical theology who believe that kerygmatic or biblical theology is sufficient unto itself, and that contact with philosophy must betray the pure biblical truth. For Kroner is completely in earnest about the religious significance of philosophy. True, faith has the primacy and priority; nevertheless philosophy has an essential task to do in clarifying, criticizing and communicating biblical faith. While inadequate or defective philosophical ideas thwart or distort the faith, conversely an adequate philosophy plays an essential role in the understanding and communicating of faith. Professor Kroner's own philosophic work is the best possible answer to these theological despisers of philosophy. For it is living witness to the fact that a man can be a philosopher and a Christian and that philosophy has great and indispensable services to render Christian faith in this as in other centuries.

JOHN A. HUTCHISON

Department of Religion, Columbia University, New York City.

Authority in Protestant Theology. By ROBERT CLYDE JOHNSON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 224 pp. \$4.50.

Dr. Johnson in this volume proves himself to be a creative historical theologian. From first to last the reader feels that a clearly delineated method of analysis is being conscientiously employed as the problem of authority is considered in several movements in Classical Protestant thought. I cannot recall a finer bit of clear, helpful historical analysis of the changing nature of a theological problem as it moves from one thinker or group of thinkers to another, than we have in this volume.

The problem of authority is treated as "the previous question" in all theological endeavor. It is likened to the knot on the thread which Kierkegaard warned we need if we are to do any "sewing." Dr. Johnson is out to find out, if he can, what knot is used by various men and to suggest the nature of the knot that Protestants should use.

He begins with Luther and Calvin (handling each with a skillful human touch) and confronts us with Luther's "singular position": "We have no obligation to believe, except what God has commanded us in the Scriptures to believe, to which no one may add, and from which no one may subtract" (p. 27). While Luther permitted some latitude in the interpretation of this principle, he both refused to try to prove its truth (thinking it to be self-evident) and insisted upon its centrality in all Christian thought. His conceptions of "law," "gospel," "freedom" and "salvation" are all firmly based on Scripture—as he understood it. He is saved from "literalism" by

what can only be called a most fluid conception of the "Word of God" which, as Dr. Johnson says, was "... so flexible that he had no difficulty subsuming within it whatever particular area of theology happened to be his immediate concern" (p. 40).

We are treated to the same careful presentation of "the previous question" in John Calvin. Like Luther, he held that the Bible is not only the "source of all legitimate dogmatic material" but also the "certain and correct criterion" of Christian doctrine. Yet Calvin, like Luther, was fighting a running battle against literalism. His insistence on the vital relationship of the Holy Spirit to both Scripture and man in the act of reading Scripture provided him with a measure of freedom in his use of the Bible which his less skillful followers lost.

Nothing less than Dr. Johnson's entire book can do justice to his study of the "nineteenth-century revolt" against the wooden orthodoxy that had developed in Protestantism, the "prophetic reaction" in Kierkegaard, Forsyth and others, and the many facets of the "contemporary milieu," with Tillich, Aulén and Ferré being among those receiving special attention. The condensation of Tillich's thought in some fifty pages makes "heavy weather for the sailor," but is, in the main, correct. The exposition of Karl Barth's thought is most helpful and will clarify his position—until he writes another volume in his *Dogmatics*—then all bets are off!

I would not want several critical reactions to dim by one whit the luster of this book. Yet I miss a sense of the vigorous interplay of influence between science, philosophy and theology in all these periods, especially the modern one. Luther and Calvin assume the validity of the highly debatable ontological and logical procedures of scholasticism—even though both depreciate reason. Both the "nineteenth-century" and "prophetic" reactions were deeply influenced by radical developments in epistemology or theory of knowledge. And when Tillich insists that theology must get "beyond naturalism and supernaturalism," he is but one of a score of eminent thinkers who has rejected as dead or dying the traditional ontological dualism that has been slain by the radical metaphysical developments of our time.

I miss, too, any serious evaluation of the meaning of authority for the theologians of the liberal tradition—men like McGiffert, Rall, Mathews, Farmer and many others. For them, as well as for the ones considered in this volume, the question of authority is "the previous question" of theology.

HAROLD A. BOSLEY

First Methodist Church, Evanston, Illinois.

The New Testament and Mythology. By BURTON H. THROCKMORTON, JR.
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 255 pp. \$4.50.

To the man in the street I suppose that a myth means a religious story that is not true; but readers of this journal are doubtless familiar with the idea that myth is, at least, the poetry of religion, saying things that are true in a way that mere factual prose could not. The Garden of Eden is nowhere on the map, but the serpent still speaks to Everyman and Everywoman. Professor Bultmann's "demythologization" is a kind of middle position. He sees the value of what the Christian saga states in mythic form. But as Throckmorton notes, he "tends to presuppose the universality of his own kind of rationalism" (p. 62), and considers it not only possible but desirable to turn biblical poetry into existentialist prose. Reversing the familiar liberal line, he sees the essence of the New Testament not in the "religion of Jesus" but in the Pauline

experience of death to the world and new life in Christ. This has some connection with the fact that Jesus was crucified; though my impression is that Bultmann's piety would be little shaken if that also were proved to be a legendary tale.

To this discussion Professor Throckmorton contributes a summary of Bultmann's procedure, a review of some detailed criticisms of it, and a statement of his own view of the meaning of the stories of the "Christ-event." He somewhat misrepresents himself in the statement quoted on the jacket that he partly agrees and partly disagrees with Bultmann's theology. He accepts many details of Bultmann's criticism, but differs basically in maintaining that mythology is not to be repudiated but to be used, and that there is meaning for us in many items that Bultmann simply discards, such as the Virgin Birth and the Millennium.

His book will be helpful to those who wish a brief introduction to Bultmann's *Entmythologisierung*, with intelligent comments on it. He might have done better, however, if he had waited to assimilate more thoroughly the results of his graduate studies before publishing; his chapters often read like seminar papers, as I suppose originally some of them were. There is a mixture of book reports and reflections, as when we are given comments on what Schniewind thinks of what Bultmann thinks of what Paul thought about Jesus; or when a chapter on mythology which overwhelms us with extracts from three ancient and twenty-five modern authors is followed by Throckmorton's own useful discussion of New Testament mythology. With this I partly agree and partly disagree, but there is no point in plunging into that kind of discussion here. A writer on Bultmann should be more deeply at home in the works of Bultmann (for the demythologizer cannot be separated from the form-critic), and indeed in the Bible and the things of God. A foretaste of the more profound contributions which we may expect from Throckmorton in the future is found in the final chapter, "The Authority of the Bible," which faces the question of a religious authority that can be real though not infallible; but this remains rather loosely connected with the rest of the book.

EDWARD R. HARDY

Professor of Church History, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Hinge of History. By CARL MICHALSON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959. 256 pp. \$3.95.

The thesis of this existential approach to Christianity is that the eschatological history of the Christian faith gives meaning and fulfillment to ordinary history. Christ, "the event in which our whole existence finds its full summation" (p. 46), is the hinge of history. "To know who he is means to have a history. For history is life with a meaning, and . . . only one who is the Lord of time holds all time together" (p. 173).

After considering "dimensions" of history (Chap. I), and the limited perspectives of science and reason, Professor Michalson notes that secular existentialism leads to meaninglessness because of the apparent absence of God. But God is present "at the point in history called Jesus Christ" (p. 140), a "being there for us" (p. 141), a "truth which judges our partial truths" (p. 221). God in Christ is the paradigm of history which "gives all history its new point of beginning" (p. 146). Though God is "hidden," Michalson does know what God's prerogatives are (p. 153), how man is "in God" (156), and that God is prior to both natural and ethical laws, knowing "no good but what he wills" (p. 161). (Scotists please note!)

Now the Christ event is "a special order of event which does not *cease* to happen" (p. 182). The Resurrection is an eschatological event, not past but future (p. 196), for it points to the goal of life. "The resurrection is God's speech in Christ which inaugurates the new age" (p. 200). Creative preaching witnesses to this "beginning of all truth" (p. 226). And the church is an eschatological community constituted by "God's saving deed" (p. 237), which must trust, in spite of all, in "the God beyond all Gods" (p. 243).

This book is vigorous in its assertions and single-minded in its emphasis. It approaches virtuosity in discussing contemporary theological subtleties (e.g., pp. 104, 109, 195n.), it offers suggestive interpretations of older concepts (e.g. logos, p. 133; docetism, pp. 186f.), and it provides valuable clarification on such matters as kerygma and myth (pp. 191, 203f.). Yet, Professor Michalson over-intellectualizes Christianity. The paradigmatic event of God in Christ grants meaning and coherence to our life, we are told, but we are never shown what kind of meaning or on what levels it occurs. Indeed, one is impressed by the author's omission of the ethical meaning and demands of Christian faith. In a time of moral chaos, we read that a Christian is "one who is inexplicably moved to choose the event of Christ as the presence of God and to make that event the very form of his existence" (p. 165). But what does this neo-Calvinism mean for the daily life? Sacrificial goodwill as the *telos* to the Christian's ethical life is not considered. Nor are we told anything about the workings of the Holy Spirit in bringing about individual and social righteousness. Instead we find reiterated finalistic assertions about Christ as the paradigm "which forms the very possibility of an ultimately meaningful history" (p. 240).

Professor Michalson has become so excited about the novelties of current existentialism and the alleged insights into human nature offered by such odd chaps as Rilke, Nietzsche, and Hölderlin (none of whom had Christian family experience), that he has forgotten about that side of Christian faith found in nonmonastic saints like Kagawa, which stresses the love of God as a real power in the daily affairs of men, families, and nations.

The book's scholarship is initially impressive but there is some jargon, too many strains are put on ordinary words, and there is not enough carefully developed argument (e.g., p. 224). One occasionally gets the impression of proof-texting (e.g., pp. 94, 131, 133) and an overconcern for modernity. Though six unpublished Drew doctoral dissertations are carefully footnoted, documentation for quotations from major thinkers is too often omitted (e.g., pp. 92, 105, 137) and lesser figures (Thibon, Kähler) are not even identified. Elsewhere documentation approaches pedantry.

The Hinge of History is a learned and stimulating statement of one view of Christianity. Fortunately there are others.

WARREN E. STEINKRAUS

Professor of Philosophy and Religion, Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky.

Human Freedom and Social Order: An Essay in Christian Philosophy.

By JOHN WILD. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1959. xi-250 pp. \$5.00.

In 1957 the Lilly Foundation granted funds to Duke University to establish a research program in the important area of Christianity and politics. Dr. Wild's book is one of the first indications of the thinking to which this program addresses itself.

Not all of the book's content was delivered as lectures at Duke, but it may be assumed that its total scope is contributory to the Duke program.

Dr. Wild is concerned about the impersonalistic rationalism which has obsessed the mind of Western man as the model for thought in all areas of humane interests. The so-called "subjective" elements which make up the bulk of human life have been shunted aside as unworthy of the philosopher's mettle. The true or real has been systematically identified with what can be thought generally, abstractly, and dispassionately. Consequently, deeper and more vital issues have been relegated to a limbo of vague impressionism. Armed with a phenomenological perspective, an existential urgency, and a fairly orthodox Christian conviction, the author attempts to show what an emaciated picture of human life is projected by rationalism, and to outline the possibilities for a Christian philosophy which will be adequate to the profundities of human existence. He construes this proposed Christian philosophy in no narrow terms. It is a form of thinking which is open to all secular knowledge, yet is guided by the formative image of Christian faith. It will move naturally into the questions of morality, and its implications for the political life of man. Dr. Wild does not purport to work out in any detail this philosophical venture. Rather, he attempts to indicate the need for it, to suggest the lines along which it may be successfully prosecuted, and to show what type of Christian ethos may be expected to develop from it.

I am so much in sympathy with the major burden of the book that I regret the manner in which its many exciting and, to me, incontrovertible insights are enmeshed with unclarified notions and generalizations. The book's "big question—big answer" approach leads to a distressing use of omnibus terms, each of which may fairly be called to give account of itself. Particularly irritating are references to those deceptively oversimplified counters, so sadly misused in contemporary Protestant dialectical games—the "Biblical view of life," the "Greek view of life." "Rationalism," called Gnosticism, is referred to without regard to nuances in its use. Faith, another notoriously ambiguous term, is casually identified with a certain reading of Christian faith. It has "its own way of understanding" (pp. 71, 80), but how it can ever do business with reason after Wild's rather drastic strictures upon reason, remains a neat puzzle. Buberism, with its cavalier reading of the notion of "It" as identical with "object" as a "thing," carries excessive weight in Wild's discussion of community—a notion which the author has divested of its necessary impersonal factors (cf., pp. 186-7 and 194). "Freedom," instead of the guiding Christian image promised the reader, is used in several senses: as the goal of the Christian life, a description of man's existential situation, and the norm of political structures (pp. 182, 205, 214, 215, 229). The Christian image itself is not made clear. It is called "faith" at one point, but also "the body of meaning and feeling which constitutes the Christian Revelation" (p. 118). At another point the guiding image seems to be identified with a reinterpretation of the Apostles' Creed (pp. 46ff.), though we are also informed that faith cannot be identified with propositions.

On the other hand, among the many illuminating sections of the book is that in which Dr. Wild offers a reinterpretation of Plato's myth of the cave, revealing as he does so the presuppositions and inadequacies of the Platonic view. The development of the concept of the *Lebenswelt* is a piece of first-rate perceptive analysis which should give pause to those forms of naturalism which insist that measured space-time and "objectively" observed events are all there is to history. The analysis of self-realization

ethics, although excessively severe on ethics of that type, is set off convincingly from the Christian ethic of self-giving.

The faults of the book spring from the same source as its virtues. The efforts to treat the main stream of Western philosophy, to develop the possible grounds of a Christian philosophy, and to say something relevant to the issues of Christianity and politics, open the doors to speculation of the most creative and exciting type, but also tempt the author to a loose and sweeping management of his materials. The book probably attempts too many things at the same time which, although they are cast in a unitary perspective, divert the reader into by-paths of criticism in which he would like to spend more time with the author's fertile and insightful mind. The volume can be guaranteed to lead to an existential engagement with Dr. Wild's thesis and its supporting line of exposition and argument.

CLYDE A. HOLBROOK

Chairman of the Department of Religion, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

Strength of Men and Nations. By WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. viii-248 pp. \$3.50.

Writing in his mid-eighties, Professor Hocking calls for a reappraisal of American foreign policy. He believes our present policy is based upon outmoded assumptions: first, that the cold war is between "communism" and "democracy" rigidly defined in nineteenth-century terms; second, that there are no basic underlying agreements among the world's peoples; thirdly, that the "balance of terror" must be maintained if we are to be secure.

He denies the first assumption by noting that the U.S.S.R. has moved toward democratic capitalism under the pressure of events; that the U.S.A. has moved toward socialism, again under the pressure of events. While recognizing the differences in the two policies, he sees them moving toward each other in significant degrees. He denies the second assumption in that individuals are much the same despite the fact that they live in different countries; that there is some basis in fact for "natural law" and mutual involvement in every predicament; that ideologies cannot be imposed, but will have to be modified in the direction of the basic directionality within persons and groups. He denies the third assumption that our only security lies in the maintenance of some "balance of terror." He does so in terms of "the world-mission" of peoples. Granting that nationalism is an essential ingredient of the present situation, he asserts that "provincial morality," i.e., morality limited to the group to which one happens to belong, is a misnomer. Morality is essentially universal in scope. Since this is the case, every group must extend its interests to a world scale. The U.S.S.R. apparently recognized this as its mission, and the U.S.A. is only slowly becoming aware of it. The "dialectic of history" is on the side of a confluence of interest in the world-mission of both East and West.

With this as his world view, Professor Hocking proposes that we drop our defensive stance, develop creative approaches to the purposes and goals of others, and speed up our own belated recognition of our role as leaders in needed reconstructions. He admits that this involves risks, but believes our present stance involves even greater dangers. He would have American political leaders admit the inadequacies of our own policies, and recognize the values which may be found in those of the U.S.S.R. Once the "black versus white" logic is removed from our public philosophy, we may proceed with the more productive task of helping the needy countries share more equitably in the goods and values potentially available to all mankind.

It should be noted that Hocking does not call for any unilateral disarmament. He understands the significance of man's will to power, but believes we should seek more positive relations with all men even though we retain our power to deter possible aggressors.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT

Professor of Philosophy of Religion, The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado.

Sandals at the Mosque: Christian Presence Amid Islam. By KENNETH CRAGG. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. 150 pp. \$2.75.

Kenneth Cragg's *The Call of the Minaret* was so enthusiastically received that readers will properly expect in this book another excellent treatment of Islam. They will not be disappointed, for this sequel to the former volume maintains the same high level of scholarship and insight exhibited in that work. Both are especially remarkable for the sympathetic understanding their author, who is currently Canon of St. George's Cathedral in Jerusalem and was formerly Professor of Arabic and Islamics at The Hartford Seminary Foundation, has of the Muslim world. The former work dealt chiefly with historical and doctrinal issues; this new volume is an exploration into the religious world of Islam.

In the first of the book's three sections, Dr. Cragg analyzes the basic elements of a typical mosque sermon. Then he explains why it is that many Muslims fail to attend the mosque service and that among modern Muslims there exist many grave problems concerning the place of the ancient faith in the modern world. The second section explores possible interrelationships between Islam and Christianity. The author holds that before Islam, Christians must have deep humility combined with openness and entire honesty. Yet he also holds that issues must not be tranquilized, for Christians have a deep responsibility to their faith which provides a radical assessment of other faiths, offering them depth and fulfillment. Finally, against central Muslim emphases upon *shirk*, *Islam and Muslimun*, the author holds the Cross of Christ, and finds that in its light Islam falls short of full understanding at the three points of man's sin, God's sovereignty, and the answer to the human predicament. He warns, however, that the true gospel is autobiography, personal and corporate, and that Christians must not be guilty of spiritual imperialism. The invitation of the gospel, he concludes, is "not the favour of an *elite* but the debt of the forgiven . . . It exists to give, not to get; to preach, not to strive; to welcome, not to proselytize" (p. 142).

This is an informative and stimulating book. The reviewer finds Cragg's emphases on humility, sensitivity, personal commitment as the bases of "Christian presence amid Islam" to be absolutely essential not only ideally but practically. Any other attitudes on the part of Christians among educated Muslims are today both impossible and unjustified. The descriptions of Muslim attitudes and problems are most revealing to those who have not had the author's opportunities for intimate contact with Islam. The suggestions concerning common meeting points open the possibility at least of conversation between the two faiths. One of the basic problems facing Christian apologists speaking to Muslims is that of interpreting their own faith in its widest and deepest terms. Here, too, Dr. Cragg's suggestions, while not final, are surely helpful.

The half-dozen pages of Islamic terms are a good feature of this little book, as is the brief bibliography. This is the first volume of a series on "Christian presence"

among the various world religions. If succeeding volumes meet the standard set by this one, this series will make a very significant contribution to Christian understanding of its relation to the other world faiths.

J. CALVIN KEENE

Professor of Religion, The St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York.

The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age. By G. D. YARNOLD. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. 207 pp. \$4.25.

God in the Space Age. By MARTIN J. HEINECKEN. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1959. viii-216 pp. \$3.50.

The theological implications of the scientific discoveries which have led to the release of atomic power and the exploration of space form the content of these timely books. Both grapple with the general problem of the relation between science and religion and proceed to make specific applications to Christian faith and life.

To Yarnold, warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, England, who is as much at home in physics as in theology, the relation between Christianity and the natural sciences is not a conflict to be resolved. He speaks rather of the modern world as passing through a far-reaching crisis precipitated by its inability to assimilate a vast increase of scientific knowledge and a prodigious growth of technical power. This crisis, which tests our whole spiritual being at every level, is presented under three main aspects. First is the intellectual problem of understanding the universe of which we are part. To solve it scientific explanation "from below" must be supplemented by a wider and deeper explanation "from above," a theology of nature which includes scientific knowledge but transcends it. Second is the crisis of faith, the urgent necessity of obtaining a firmer hold upon basic Christian verities by re-examining them against the background of the new knowledge. Third is the crisis of living, the life-and-death question of bringing the whole range of technical activity under the standard of the Christian doctrine of man and of applying the pattern of life in Christ to the nuclear age.

Heinecken's book is more limited in scope and more popular in style. Here the central question is: what impact does the launching of space satellites have upon faith in God? The key to the answer is provided by the distinction between the I-it relation and the I-Thou relation. While scientific research can unfold the wonder and complexity of the physical universe, it can never afford the personal confrontation with God which is the essence of faith. The goal of faith is not achieved "by climbing to a star but by passing through death and resurrection to judgment and to glory." The sharp division between the realm of scientific investigation and the realm of personal existence in which the redemptive acts of God obtain their meaning leads to a rejection of such views as pantheism and naturalism. It does not make for a constructive theology of nature such as Yarnold seeks. Heinecken sees more clearly, however, that the ultimate issue is not intellectual clarification but the overcoming of man's sinful will. He interprets the present anxiety as God's judgment and sounds the note of warning and repentance.

Both authors show an alert understanding of the work of the scientists, both use biblical criticism to penetrate to the core of revealed truth, and both owe much to Karl Heim.

T. A. KANTONEN

Professor of Systematic Theology, Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio.

Conversion. By E. STANLEY JONES. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 253 pp. \$3.25 cl., \$1.95 pa.

E. Stanley Jones has focused his warm faith and his cumulative world experience on the what, the why, and the how of Christian conversion. In these fifteen chapters he considers the problem with the interest and style of a dedicated Christian who hopes to convert people. There is none of the cold analysis of the psychologist and little of the preoccupation with accurate formulation of the theologian. This is the warm and persuasive book of an evangelist whose devotion to Christ and whose concern for those outside the Kingdom are paramount.

The narrative approach is engaging. It is marked with striking illustrations from Christian service in all continents and with some striking epigrams. The material is pertinent to contemporary life. This wise Christian leader knows pretty well what is eating at people. He understands the domestic tragedies and the world crises alike as subject to the transforming power of the gospel of Christ. He knows how it seems to a man to feel lost without knowing what he is lost from or what he needs to be saved to. This yearning and sincere evangelist looks out on a world in need of conversion and says in the words of Christ, "Ye must be born again."

The idea of conversion here refers to the power of the gospel to change the lives of people who feel the need of change and who commit themselves to Christ. It involves "deliverance from what you are now instead of deliverance from what you shall be in some future world." It involves a new set of concerns which bring sunshine and morality to life. It means the unification of the divided self around the person of Christ so that the hell of guilt and fear is overcome.

Conversion of the self demands unconditional surrender. The egocentricity of man is not easily overcome, but there is no other way. The egocentric life must become the Christocentric life. This surrender has three stages—"mood, movement, and moment." By mood he refers to the unbearable conflicts and futilities that bring on the longing for surrender. Movement means the action of the Holy Spirit by which one is reoriented toward the waiting arms of the Lord. Moment has reference to that point in time when the full new commitment is made. Since love is the basic human motive, it is essential that love be converted. All kinds and levels of love fall under the same requirement. Since God is love, the truly converted heart is one with God.

The rich illustrative material of the book is centered in the central pages which give a number of actual cases of conversion. These inspiring examples afford consolation and hope. They are equally interesting for analytic consideration. This is a concrete book on conversion rather than an abstract treatise.

A chapter on "The Fruits of Conversion" is followed by a somewhat more detailed review of the results on health, conversation and learning. Then comes the chapter on "How?" which outlines the steps in a clear and simple manner. The will is converted when "you are with Christ facing life together." The book concludes with a glance at reconversion, the cultivation of conversion, the role of the Christian in bringing others to conversion, and the Holy Spirit in conversion. The Holy Spirit enables us to move "from the seventh chapter of Romans into the eighth." The social implications are adumbrated under the heading, "Conversion and the Kingdom of God."

Any congregation will be better served by a minister who reads the book. Any layman will find great preaching and personal witness in its pages. Theologians,

philosophers, and psychologists will wish that this thoughtful and experienced missionary-evangelist would write an additional short article for this periodical in which he would set forth a summary of his deep insights on conversion in the concise theological language of the classroom, without the benefit of the rich illustrative and quoted material which is necessary to fulfil the purpose of the present book. E. Stanley Jones has something important to say to the scholars as well as to the rank and file. One finishes the book feeling, "It's me, O Lord, standing in the need of prayer."

PERRY E. GRESHAM

President, Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia.

Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Volume II: The Nineteenth Century in Europe, The Protestant and Eastern Churches. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. viii-532 pp. \$7.00.

The first volume of this projected five-volume series was reviewed in the 1959 Summer issue of this journal by William R. Cannon. That volume sketched the background and the program of the series, then delineated the Catholic phase.

This second volume compresses within its covers the major aspects of Protestant and Eastern Orthodox history. No other one-volume work, comparable either in scope or detail, is available. This is an encyclopedic coverage of Christian history country by country. A sense of depth is provided by its binocular view: one eye is evangelical, the other ecumenical. Yet the reporting is factual and fair.

Since no one can be a specialist in so many areas it is to be expected that the author has depended upon secondary sources, i.e., monographs, encyclopedia articles, etc. In general the works cited in the eighteen pages of bibliography are the most recent and representative.

The author's concern to discover "vitality" in the various churches leads him to give continued attention to awakenings. These occurred in Europe at a time when there were "notable revivals in the United States" (p. 157). It is implied that since they appear simultaneously they arose from a common impulse. But that is to beg the question. Moreover, to focus so largely on awakenings is to stress the subjective side to the relative neglect of the liturgical and the ecclesiastical. Doctrine and theology receive some attention, but scarcely enough to form a history of doctrine.

The central thesis is the conflict of Christianity with hostile secular forces. Hence the treatment is religiously sympathetic, entering warmly into the recitation of evidences of living faith, rejoicing at appearances of vitality. The author wants Christianity to win; so do we. Other reviewers have noted Latourette's optimism, leading to the suggestion that he may give inadequate treatment to the lamentable phases of Christianity, e.g., bigotry, hostility to science, divisiveness, etc. The picture of anti-Christian forces is scarcely full-blooded.

"Revolution," "revolutionary forces," "revolutionary age"—these phrases with their varying connotations give the reader a fuzzy picture, leaving him uncertain as to whether violent revolt or merely extensive change is intended. Yet it is on the motif of revolution that the account is unified; and it, like a "frontier thesis," has decided limitations. Occasionally the mention of "revolution" is simply the decorative façade largely forgotten within the main structure of the chapter.

Biographical interest is large. Vignettes of numerous persons appear in encyclo-

pedic fashion, yet with interpretive characterizations and sympathetic treatment. Thus Chapter Three, "Germany: Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century," is a catalog of theologians, noting the events of their lives more than the points of their theology. In this section it might have been well to distinguish between the reprobation theology of Hengstenberg and the more flexible views of the Erlangen school.

A book containing so many dates can scarcely hope for complete accuracy. A sampling indicated high reliability in this book. But 1853 (p. 229, l. 11) for the World Alliance of the Y.M.C.A. (cf., p. 216), and 1891 (p. 336, l. 3) for final Methodist separation are incorrect. In view of the fact that Lutherans in Russia, excluding Finland, numbered well over a million before World War I, something more than mere mention on page 475 would seem justified.

In general this is a masterful work, the product of a skilled guide. His program is: (1) to outline what is to be viewed on the tour, (2) to conduct the tour so that the important things are seen, and (3) to evaluate the experience. Thus the book has notable unity and depth, remarkable coherence and coverage.

WILLARD D. ALLBECK

Professor of Historical Theology, Hama Divinity School of Wittenburg University, Springfield, Ohio.

Protestant Thought From Rousseau to Ritschl. By KARL BARTH. Trans. by Brian Cozens. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 435 pp. \$7.00.

It has been said of Karl Barth as a teacher that his capacity for ruthless criticism is made the servant of his will to listen. Both the critical sense and the will to listen are exhibited in this translation of eleven chapters of Barth's *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert*; and in thus displaying the wisdom of the past, Barth indirectly reveals himself as both a modern and a free theologian.

The German version of this history of modern Protestant theology appeared first in 1947, but its real origin was Barth's classroom lectures to his students at Bonn during the twenties. Although the strictly theological chapters in the original work and those presented here (on Schleiermacher, Feuerbach, Strauss, and Ritschl) appear to be rather narrowly confined to the German theological tradition, appearances are deceiving. For this book is in fact an account of the emergence of modern man from the eighteenth century onward (as the chapters on Man in the Eighteenth Century, Rousseau, Lessing, Kant, Herder, Novalis, and Hegel indicate).

For those who have supposed "dialectical theology" to be an assault on the dignity of modern man, calculated to drive man into a corner from which only "faith" can rescue him, Barth's chapter on Man in the Eighteenth Century must come as a surprise. Barth is not afraid to celebrate the powers of modern man. The bold intention of Enlightenment man to "trust his own judgment," the intention of modern man to claim for himself the whole cosmos through the exercise of his intellectual powers, the intention of scientific man to discern everywhere in nature and history the pattern and structure of causal interaction—all these Barth notes, and not grudgingly. The more mature modesty with which Kant describes man's intellectual powers but also discerns their limits, even Hegel's drive toward universal truth through a universal method culminating in a comprehensive universal system—these too Barth calls to our attention. Not alone the intellectual powers, but also the moral powers of modern man, discerned by Kant and employed by him to set

out a comprehensive proposal for "Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone"—these powers are also passed in review. Even the expressive powers of the individual, uncovered by the Romantic movement, have their day in the chapters on Novalis and Herder.

Barth also attends to those places where modern man disengages himself from the Christian tradition, and here perhaps the most illuminating chapter is on Lessing and the "broad ugly ditch" between the "accidental truths of history" and the "universal truths of reason." Yet Barth goes on to note the categories of "experience" and "history" which the later Lessing began to elaborate, and which stood Schleiermacher in such good stead.

In Schleiermacher one finds the Christian theologian who intends to be also with integrity a modern man. While acutely sensitive to Schleiermacher's modernity, Barth by no means wishes to dishonor Schleiermacher by denying his title as Christian theologian. Is there not a place in the Christian theological cosmos for a theology such as Schleiermacher's which begins with man in relation to God, a theology of the powers bestowed upon man by the Holy Spirit? But granted the provisional legitimacy of the program, Barth finally asks, what of its execution? Is there in Schleiermacher's system adequate place for the other pole of Christian theology, the objectivity of the Word, the freedom of God's revelation in Jesus Christ? And if the real deity of the Word is called into question, may not one begin to wonder if the powers of man in relation to God are adequately acknowledged as from the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son?

There is in this book a will to listen. There is also implicitly (and at times explicitly) criticism. Barth is a free theologian who believes he can best be a modern theologian by being also a free theologian. He is a theologian who believes that modern man can best be saved both from the apotheosis of his powers and from falling into self-contempt, by being confronted with the new humanity in Jesus Christ. Or as Barth puts it at the end of his discussion of Kant: Kant seems dimly to discern the possibility of a theology with a different starting-point than his own. Such a theology would be a theology "which proves that God exists by means of the fact that He has spoken in the Bible."

WENDELL S. DIETRICH

Department of Religion, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

John Calvin's Tracts and Treatises. 3 Volumes. With Historical Notes and Introduction by T. F. TORRANCE. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958. cxi-352 pp., xxxi-592 pp., xvi-521 pp. \$15.00 (\$6.00 per volume).

Now that the volumes of the Edinburgh (Calvin Translation Society) edition of John Calvin's Works, after a century of use, are beginning to disintegrate, it is good to have this well-bound reprint of the *Tracts and Treatises* in its attractive jacket. Professor Torrance's forty-page introduction offers a clear and readable summary of the main positions defended in the text, and the historical notes he has provided for the individual treatises are both pertinent and admirably brief. A few of the titles in the tables of contents have been reworded and the frontispiece vignette of Calvin is lacking; but the original edition is otherwise unaltered. The excellent Translator's Prefaces and Beza's "carefully written" life of Calvin are included.

Professor Torrance notes (p. vi) that theology today "once more returns to

Calvin for guidance and inspiration" and he stresses also the "relevance of [Calvin's] teaching for the active mission of the Church" today. The judgment should be valid not only for those branches of the Church which label themselves as in the Reformed tradition. As Professor Cell of Boston University reminded his readers twenty-five years ago, John Wesley repeatedly asserted that "it is the faith of our first Reformers which I by the grace of God preach" and "the true gospel touches the very edge of Calvinism." Even Professor Cannon in a more recent book (*The Theology of John Wesley*, 1944), admits the fundamental area of agreement of which Wesley himself said, "I do not differ a hair's breadth" from "Mr. Calvin."

In 1844 the translator wrote of the treatise, *The Necessity of Reforming the Church* (Vol. I), that "in reading it one is often led insensibly into the belief that instead of being the product of three centuries ago, it is a powerful protest written by some modern hand against the prevailing errors and threatened dangers of our own times" (p. xlvii). To a surprising extent his words apply today. Note for example: "Ceremonies ought to be living exercises of piety" (p. 132). "No man is a true pastor of the Church who does not perform the office of teaching" (p. 140). "Laws enacted with a view to external policy ought to be carefully obeyed, but in regard to the regulation of conscience there is no legislator but God" (p. 176). "We are not to wait for facility of action, either from the will of men or the temper of the times. . . . What the success will be it is not ours to inquire" (p. 200).

Perhaps especially relevant today is the discussion of schism and church unity. "We are ready to confess . . . that those who abandon the Church, the common mother of the faithful, the 'pillar and ground of truth,' revolt from Christ also; but we mean a Church which from incorruptible seed begets children and . . . nourishes them with spiritual food (that seed and food being the Word of God)" (p. 214). But some "hold that the communion of the Church is confined to a kind of regimen which they have struck out for themselves" (p. 216).

Obviously many sections in these three volumes will interest chiefly the church historian or the dogmatist. But even in the *Psychopannychia* (Vol. III, pp. 413-490), which in method and content as well as in title is probably the most alien to the modern mind, there are to be found expressions of a joyous faith in the life after death which offer living water to the dry agnosticism of our times.

Even these largely polemic writings show that, as Professor Haroutunian wrote of the Commentaries, John Calvin "turns the attention of the Christian not only upward but also toward the future. Hope, for Calvin, is at the heart of the Christian life." Such hope is a necessity for Christians in this nuclear age as it was four hundred years ago.

LOUISE PETTIBONE SMITH

Hartford, Connecticut. Formerly Professor of Biblical History at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768.

By NORMAN SYKES. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959. xi-238 pp. \$6.50.

Ideas of Revelation: An Historical Study, A.D. 1700 to A.D. 1860. By

H. D. McDONALD. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959. xi-300 pp. \$6.75.

These books are concerned with important developments in two very significant centuries. Between them they span the period from 1660 to 1860, and they

have in common the greater part of the eighteenth century. The continuing influence of eighteenth-century thought is only less remarkable than the contempt with which that century has often been treated. The myth of an age steeped in corruption and in rationalistic complacency has always made some concessions to giants like Berkeley and Butler, but large amends were still required. In recent years an important reassessment has been taking place. For this the chief credit must be given to Dr. Sykes—formerly professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Cambridge, now dean of Winchester and the leading church historian in Great Britain.

From Sheldon to Secker is a survey of the major issues in English religious life during the century following the Restoration. After an era of turmoil, reconstruction was necessary. The Church faced a great opportunity to equip itself to meet the problems of the new day. Because the Restoration was so largely a reactionary movement, the chance was almost wholly lost. To make matters worse, controversies within the Church of England led to the suspension of Convocation, and the Church's power to cope successfully with the difficulties it faced was further crippled. Meanwhile, nonconformity posed problems which could not be ignored. Should the moderate dissenters be comprehended within the Anglican communion? Was such a step an alternative to toleration, or a further stage in the same process? And what about the prospects of union and concord with churches abroad? And how could the true faith, challenged by deists and rationalists, be defended against attack? With skill and patience, with ingenuity and great learning, Dr. Sykes lays bare the movements of the age. We see what might have been, and what was; and we understand why, at the end of the period, Archbishop Secker was perforce content to manoeuvre within sadly circumscribed limits. This book is indispensable to anyone who wishes either to appreciate the eighteenth century or to understand why so many of the issues now confronting us assume the form they do.

Ideas of Revelation is a Ph.D. thesis. In a work of this kind, detailed information often obscures the larger issues: perspective is sacrificed to facts. Dr. McDonald is never guilty of this fault. He realizes that the concept of revelation, so crucial in current theology, was not wholly ignored by the thinkers of previous generations. He carries his story from 1700 to 1860—from the deists, through the latitudinarians and the great leaders of eighteenth-century thought (Berkeley, Butler, Law), through Wesley and the evangelicals, to Coleridge, Hare, and F. D. Maurice. The book contains much skillful exposition. The principal issues are clearly grasped. They are usually accurately described.

It may also be remarked, however, that if Ph.D. theses have characteristic faults, they usually have distinctive virtues. They are normally exact and accurate and they are equipped with elementary scholarly aids. It is here that this book is conspicuously at fault. The number of minor mistakes is astonishing—names misspelled, titles inaccurately or inconsistently quoted, references wrongly given. It is very difficult wholly to avoid such errors, but they should be kept within bounds. Some of them might have been caught by the examiner, some by the publisher's reader, some by the reader of the proofs, many of them by anyone even slightly familiar with the period. Nor has the work, in any true sense, either an index or a bibliography; instead, it has something that is an exasperating cross between the two, and which achieves the functions of neither. This is a wholly inappropriate apparatus to append to a learned work. It almost destroys any possibility of its being consulted for scholarly purposes, except by those with the leisure to read it through

and make their own index. It is unfortunate that a useful book has been defaced by such needless defects.

GERALD A. CRAGG

Professor of Historical Theology, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

Trumpet Call of Reformation. By OLIVER READ WHITLEY. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1959. 252 pp. \$3.95.

A generation ago H. Richard Niebuhr demonstrated convincingly in his *Social Sources of Denominationalism* that denominational history may be fruitfully explored through sociological analysis. Unfortunately few students of American church life have followed Niebuhr's pioneer lead. Now, at long last, appears a work which recounts the history of one denomination, the Disciples of Christ, from a sociological standpoint.

Trumpet Call of Reformation is the winner of the 1958 Bethany Book Award. Its author is Associate Professor of the Sociology of Religion at Iliff School of Theology. He interprets the unfolding drama of Disciples' history by applying a framework of analysis known as institutional transition from sect to church. Emerging under frontier conditions as a protest group against the divided state of Christendom and against the worldliness of organized Christianity, the Disciples of Christ embodied all the earmarks of a sectarian group. This double emphasis, which positively stated includes the quest for "unity" and the quest for "restoration," is a key to the understanding of the group's history and of some of its present internal tensions.

The movement from sect to denomination involved an interaction with American society, so that the Disciples inevitably adapted and accommodated to the surrounding culture. With the cooling of sectarian ardor, what was earlier frowned upon became eagerly embraced; cultural values once denied were now affirmed; protest gave way to acquiescence. Instead of healing the divisions of Christianity, the Disciples added a few schismatic splinters of their own. And, by diligent search of the record, divergent factions or viewpoints could claim equal support from the writings or sayings of Thomas Campbell or from those of his son, Alexander.

As a contribution to the self-understanding of Disciples of Christ adherents, this book doubtless serves a valuable function. In its ordering and illuminating interpretation of historical data, it is not only interesting history but also a vivid reminder of the dialogue that takes place between church and culture. But as a contribution to the sociology of religion, this work has severe limitations. Where the author discusses sociological theory he seems most vulnerable. This is done in the first chapter, which, by all odds, is the most disappointing. Here the author strings together one quotation after another, with little added commentary, not to speak of critical appraisal. He cites the theories of Troeltsch, Niebuhr, Park, Clark, Becker, Pope, Yinger, and Wach, but fails to deal with these theories in a creative fashion. He seems to regard all sect groups as inevitably involved in the movement from sect to denomination or church. Yet such sectarian groups as the Dukhobors, Dunkards, Amish, and Hutterian Brethren have persisted for generations relatively unchanged.

Again in a later theoretical discussion (pp. 159ff.), the author proposes an analysis of the "internal dimension" of the group, which consists of polity, structure, and organization. Yet his own interpretation is not pursued, as the entire process is discussed only in terms of organization.

The book ends on a prophetic note which depicts the need for a strategy to implement social concerns. On this score the author has some provocative things to say not only to the Disciples of Christ, but to all Protestant groups who wish to relate Christian ethics to social policy in a vital and viable way.

ROBERT LEE

Assistant Professor of Church and Community, Union Theological Seminary,
New York City.

Brothers of the Faith. By STEPHEN C. NEILL. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
192 pp. \$4.00.

Bishop Neill is to be congratulated on recounting the development of the ecumenical movement in a new way. Instead of formally recording the history and citing from official documents, he tells the story in terms of the personalities which during the last fifty years have contributed most to it. This approach does not result in a complete picture and some of the material essential to an adequate perspective is lacking, but the method has the compensating advantage of giving an account which is highly readable and full of human interest.

This is definitely an "inside" story. Bishop Neill has been close enough to the center of the movement to be able to speak in a personal vein and to record impressions at firsthand. Under his perceptive treatment figures like John R. Mott, Bishop Brent, Archbishop Söderblom, Archbishop Temple, J. H. Oldham, Bishop Oxnham, and Dr. Visser 't Hooft come vividly alive. One of the best of the biographical sketches is that of Samuel Azariah, Bishop of Dornakal in India, about whom most Americans know little but whose role both in the United Church of South India and in the plea of the younger churches for unity was very great.

One could wish that Bishop Neill had had space for a larger portrait gallery. Many faces are missing (especially American faces) or only glimpsed incidentally. This reviewer would have liked, for example, to see a fuller recognition of William Adams Brown, who more than any other man initiated the process that led to the uniting of "Life and Work" and "Faith and Order" to form the World Council of Churches.

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

Formerly Executive Secretary of the World Council of Churches in the United States. Bronxville, New York.

The Quest for Church Unity. By MATTHEW SPINKA. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960. 85 pp. \$2.50.

Matthew Spinka has done distinguished work as professor, editor, and author. In the present volume, *The Quest for Church Unity*, with much critical skill he takes up the theme of the kind of church unity which we may expect. We cannot foresee a time when Roman Catholic thinkers would reach a unity which Protestant thinkers could accept. He makes it abundantly clear that the same is true of the Greek Orthodox Church. He marshals much evidence to support these conclusions. He does, however, reach the conclusion that a true though somewhat uneasy unity is possible between the Protestant groups. This he works out with much detailed consideration. The book is enriched by more than ample learning and successfully lets the Protestant readers know where they stand.

The whole field is one where critical investigation needs to be substituted for

merely sentimental expectation. It is here that Dr. Spinka does his best work. He does not deny that in the far distant future there may be a coming together of which we can see no practical reason for expectation now. But he is careful not to build on hopes which have no basis in critical intelligence. This is a book to be read and reread until its materials become an actual part of one's mind.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

New York City. Formerly Dean of Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey.

The Waiting Father: Sermons on the Parables of Jesus. By HELMUT THIELICKE. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 192 pp. \$3.75.

Between God and Satan. By HELMUT THIELICKE. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959. x-84 pp. \$2.00.

The Purpose and Work of the Ministry. By GABRIEL J. FACKRE. Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1959. xi-141 pp. \$2.50.

Whether *The Waiting Father*, as stated in the translator's introduction, "represents the greatest preaching carried on anywhere in the world," may be open to question. But it is great preaching, and by a theological professor in the University of Hamburg, Germany. He knows how to leave his theological language in his study and at his professor's desk, and preach in language which the common man understands. If any preacher wants to know how to do this, let him read and study the technique of Dr. Thielicke in this volume on the parables of Jesus. This is preaching with life in it, because the preacher knows life and man and God.

The other smaller book of sermons, *Between God and Satan*, was issued first in 1946 at the close of the tyranny of Hitler. It deals largely with the temptations which assail the city of Mansoul, as they assailed Jesus. It does not stop with the close of that particular crisis, but deals with any ultimate hour of our experience. In simple language and words that are timeless, he speaks to four thousand hearts and minds on Sunday morning and to a like number on Wednesday evening. No young preacher should overlook these volumes.

The last book is by a young minister dedicated to his task in what he calls "a two-point charge" in a steel mill town and a mushrooming suburb. He takes his cue from Thomas Merton who found his life in the quiet of the monastery, and contrasts it with the kind of life a missionary leads in the midst of the swirling currents of the time. While a bit academic in spots and with a desire to be erudite, nevertheless it is inspiring writing and shows a deep concern for his people. The book is an outgrowth of his work in the mill district of Pittsburgh; this reviewer recommends it.

FREDERICK K. STAMM

The Community Church, Vero Beach, Florida.

A Guide to the Parables of Jesus. By HILLYER H. STRATON. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959. 198 pp. \$3.50.

Archbishop Trench's famous treatment of the Parables of our Lord, published a century ago, has had not a few excellent successors, and Dr. Straton's volume is worthy to be added to the list. To those who know the older books there is much that is familiar (how could anyone write on Christ's parables without being indebted to

previous workers in this field?), but there is also much that is fresh—and refreshing.

Dr. Straton is pre-eminently a preacher, rather than a scholar in the technical sense; but he has done his "home work" exceedingly well, and has produced a volume that ministers in particular will find most useful. In fact, taking his cue from the title of one of his previous books on the miracles, he could have called this "*Preaching the Parables of Jesus*." Dr. Straton clings to the principle that a genuine parable has only one "moral" (a necessary requirement in treating the parables of Jesus), and relates them all to our Lord's teaching concerning the Kingdom of God. Here is a worthy treatment of the inimitable "stories of Jesus," of special interest to the preacher, but also of real value to the intelligent layman.

JOHN PITTS

St. Andrew's Presbyterian Kirk, Nassau, Bahamas.

Politics and Evangelism. By PHILIPPE MAURY. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1959. 120 pp. \$2.95.

This is a stirring thing! Well translated by Marguerite Wieser from the original French edition which was published last year under the title, *Évangélisation et Politique*, it could and should become the basis of some unusual and highly worthwhile discussions for laymen who are tired of "busy work."

Maury is critical of the church at many points where orthodoxy has made it sacrosanct; where it has held to the limitations of nationalism and cult; and where it has sought scapegoats like Communism or other religions to rationalize its own failures to communicate, witness, and demonstrate the gospel.

Maury is constructive when he clears the decks of ecclesiastical clutter and really comes out bravely for a primitive church. Assuming the premise that the church must recognize political order in the light of the order of God, he warns the churchman that any aspect of political order allowed to contradict God's order must be dealt with—and forthwith! Clearly the freedom of the church is central to any implementation of such a premise.

The "blessed words" of confrontation, thrust, and encounter do appear here and there—but far more exciting words crop up to save the day. *Ethics* is a good word to see; *action* is used with respect again; *effectiveness* drops in; *risk*, *kingdom of God*, and even *task* are used in the active sense. Written in a style that does not presuppose theological training, here is a book that will communicate to and stimulate lay people for participation in the political nature of their immediate communities as well as the intercommunity and international affairs of contemporary life.

E. S. B.

Can Capitalism Compete? By RAYMOND W. MILLER. New York: Ronald Press, 1959. 264 pp. \$4.50.

Churchmen of necessity are involved in appraising, criticizing, and improving the political and economic systems under which they live. While there are still some comfortable theologians who say that whatever system *is* is "ordained of God," there are few takers for this dubious line of thought. On the other hand, there is much too much easy talk which seeks to equate Christian ethics with some particular form of economic or political system. It is at this point that Raymond Miller has made his best contribution. In an amazing variety of seventy-nine articles grouped into

thirteen sections, this book unfolds, with increasing interest, the obvious answer to the question in the title. But more than that, the reader finds himself saying that he ought to do something about it.

It may be that there has been too much depressing writing about how we are being poured into organization moulds—forced into competition for status. Miller's book gives the reader the feeling that he can do something about freedom. Two things would have improved the book: a more carefully designed topical index, and a glossary. Nevertheless, the book can be read and grasped by the lay economist and politician with both understanding and challenge.

E. S. B.

Parables From the Sea. By ROBBINS W. BARSTOW, illustrated by Ruth Lepper Gardner. Penobscot, Maine: Traversity Press, 1959. 67 pp. \$2.85.

Dr. Barstow is well known in ecumenical circles and by all friends of Hartford Theological Seminary as a Christian man of the world. But when you read this, you will forever call him "The Salt Water Parson."

From New England sailing with trips south to Bermuda and north to Nova Scotia, plus some touches of nautical lore off Scotland, Turkey, and Manila Bay, the author has meditated on the ways of the seas and boats and men. Storms demand the best of men and of boats; barnacles can teach a lesson about *some* people; mending nets in current context brings fresh insight into biblical menders of nets; crews that get sail riggings fouled—and crews that quietly and firmly don't get riggings fouled—demonstrate some obvious things about world disorder and world order; lighthouses and crossbeams come into importance as a sailor seeks knowledge of where he is and where he is headed.

No, it is not an unctious document. It is good because you find far more possibilities of moral and spiritual implication than the author points out. Dr. Barstow equips you with a boat and gives you some equipment and a few rules—but you go sailing on a glorious voyage of good salty thought and meditation. You can bet that this is going to be quoted at a lot of seaside spots this summer!

E. S. B.



A paperbound booklet, *The Christian and War* (A Theological Discussion of Justice, Peace and Love), has been published in Holland by the Historical Peace Churches and the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. It is available from the American offices of the Friends (20 S. 12th St., Philadelphia), the Church of the Brethren (Elgin, Ill.), and the Mennonites (Akron, Penna.) for thirty cents. It contains three statements: (1) "Peace is the Will of God," presented by these groups to the World Council in 1953, rejecting, on the basis of theological presuppositions of Oxford and Amsterdam, Christian participation in war. (2) A counter-statement from Angus Dun and Reinhold Niebuhr, first published in *Christianity and Crisis* in 1955. (3) A rebuttal of Dun and Niebuhr from the Peace Churches. The booklet calls upon the World Council to call churches and theologians to "a new and earnest examination of the Christian attitude toward war."

Thirty Years With the Silent Billion (Adventuring in Literacy) is Frank Lau-bach's own life story (Revell, \$3.95). The "apostle of literacy" in a warmly human

book tells the fascinating story of his life work, beginning with the Moros on Mindanao and spreading till more than 60 million people had learned to read in 200 different languages and dialects. He tells of the early experience of God underlying this work; of the open, sharing approach toward non-Christians to which he was led; describes his literacy charts and "each one teach one" technique. In his last chapter, "Teaching Literacy on Television," he points out that the population explosion is outstripping literacy and new methods are still needed and under way. "This book is not a history—it is an announcement!" says Laubach.

Association Press sends us *The Modern Reader's Guide to the Bible*, by William Hamilton (\$3.50). It is "not about the Gospels but a companion to their reading," to be used together with the R.S.V. or with the R.S.V. harmony, *Gospel Parallels* (Nelson). Fuller and more technical than the usual "study guide" but less technical and more practical than a "commentary," it brings to bear the insights of present-day theology and criticism on the important passages. This book combines in one the three previous "Reflection Books" on Matthew-Luke, Mark, and John.

Princeton University Press has a book, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, by James B. Pritchard (\$5.00), which is sufficiently nontechnical to bring recent work in this field within reach of intelligent laymen, while drawing upon his more elaborate volumes such as *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. He tells not only of what has been discovered but about the lives, methods and progress of the archaeologists concerned; gives quotations from recent translations of documents, and many fine photographs.

The latest Study in Biblical Theology (No. 28) is *Lordship and Discipleship*, by Eduard Schweizer, a complete revision of a work more descriptively entitled in the original German as "humiliation and exaltation in Jesus and his followers." Alec R. Allenson, Naperville, Ill., \$2.25.

Let Us Break Bread Together, by Fred D. Gealy, is a book of communion meditations for the church year (Abingdon, \$2.50). Grateful students of this beloved professor at S.M.U. took tape recordings of his meditations and chapel talks and compiled the book at the time of his retirement. Each begins with Scripture and closes with prayer, "linking the traditional concepts of first-century Christianity with the patterns of thought in the twentieth century." Another Abingdon book is Webb B. Garrison's *Creative Imaginations in Preaching* (\$3.00). It concentrates not on arranging material for sermons, but on "the prior question of how to find ideas and illustrations," "the initial step in sermon preparation: having something fresh to say."

Frederick K. Stamm, Congregational minister, has compiled *The Best of Charles E. Jefferson* (Crowell, \$3.95): sermons, lectures, conversations. In his introduction Dr. Stamm pays tribute to this prophetic preacher and personal friend. Jefferson "stood as a light set on a hill in the pulpit of the Broadway Tabernacle Church for thirty-one years."

Elmer J. F. Arndt has written *The Faith We Proclaim*, "The Doctrinal Viewpoint Generally Prevailing in the Evangelical and Reformed Church" (Christian Education Press, Philadelphia, \$2.50). Its perspective is "to state Christian doctrine in such a way that the mighty acts of God for us and for our salvation are kept in the forefront . . . that faith in God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ may be nurtured and the communion of saints may be furthered."

E. H. L.

